

A
TRANSLATION
OF
THE GOSPELS.
WITH NOTES.

BY ANDREWS NORTON.

VOL. II. — NOTES.

EIGHTH EDITION.

CAMBRIDGE:
JOHN WILSON AND SON,
University Press.
1888.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1855, by
CHARLES ELIOT NORTON,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

CONTENTS.

PRELIMINARY NOTES.

	PAGE
I. ON THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS, AND ON THE CHARACTER AND IMPORTANCE OF THE VARIOUS READINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT . . .	3
II. ON THE CORRESPONDENCES AMONG THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS	14
III. ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS AND THE GOSPEL OF JOHN . . .	16
IV. ON THE DATE OF THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS .	17
V. ON THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL	18
NOTES ON THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW . . .	21
NOTES ON THE GOSPEL OF MARK . . .	215
NOTES ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE . . .	241
NOTES ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN . . .	321

A P P E N D I X.

NOTE A.

THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF THE PRESENT GREEK GOSPEL OF MATTHEW	483
--	-----

NOTE B.

ON THE CHRONOLOGICAL ARRANGEMENT OF THE EVENTS RECORDED BY THE EVANGELISTS	490
---	-----

NOTE C.

ON THE CHANGE OF CHARACTER IN MEN SPOKEN OF IN THE NEW TESTAMENT AS PRODUCED BY CHRISTIANITY	496
---	-----

NOTE D.

ON THE WANT OF VERBAL EXACTNESS IN THE REPORTS OF OUR SAVIOUR'S LANGUAGE BY THE EVANGELISTS; AND ON SOME OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF HIS MODE OF TEACHING	510
--	-----

NOTE E.

ON THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE IN WHICH OUR SAVIOUR SPEAKS OF HIS PERSONAL AGENCY, AND PARTICULARLY OF HIS FUTURE "COMING"; AND ON THE EXPECTA- TIONS OF THE APOSTLES CONCERNING HIS VISIBLE RE TURN TO EARTH	519
---	-----

NOTES ON THE GOSPELS

PRELIMINARY NOTES.

I.

ON THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS, AND ON THE CHARACTER AND IMPORTANCE OF THE VARIOUS READINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IN the First Part of the “Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels,” it has been proved that they remain essentially the same as they were originally composed. But this proposition requires some explanation. The following remarks are taken from the first chapter of the work just referred to.

“In regard to St. Matthew’s Gospel, the proposition is to be understood in a particular sense. This Gospel, it is probable, was originally composed in Hebrew; and we possess only a Greek translation, made at a very early period. This translation, it will be my purpose to show, has been faithfully preserved. To this alone, the general remarks and arguments respecting the correct transmission of the Gospels, advanced in the present chapter, must be considered as *directly* applying. But no reason has ever been adduced for suspecting that the translation was not intended to be a faithful representative of the original.

“The Gospels, I have said, remain *essentially* the same as they were originally written. In common with all other ancient writings, they have been exposed to the accidents to which works preserved by transcription are liable. In the very numerous authorities for determining their text, we find a great number of differences, or various readings. But, by comparing those authorities together, we are able, in general, to ascertain satisfactorily the original text of the last three Gospels, and of the Greek translation of St. Matthew. There are, however, a few passages admitted into the Received Text (the text in common use before the publication of Griesbach’s edition), some extant in a majority of our present manuscripts, and some even in all, the genuineness of which is still questionable. Various considerations, arising from some of these passages not being found in manuscripts of the highest authority, from direct historical evidence concerning them in the writings of the Fathers, from their unsuitableness to the context, from the nature of their contents, and from the want of correspondence between their style and that of the Evangelist in whose work they now stand, may lead us to disbelieve or doubt that they proceeded from him. In mentioning such as are extant in all our present manuscripts, I refer particularly to certain passages in the Greek Gospel of Matthew. This translation was made, probably, either from one or from a very few manuscripts of the Hebrew Gospel; and however faithfully the translator intended to represent his original, he may have erred in mistaking additions or interpolations, found in the copy or copies which he followed, for portions of the genuine text.

“I will here mention the more important passages in the Received Text of the Gospels, which, from such causes as I

have spoken of, may, I think, be regarded as spurious, or as lying under suspicion. I shall reserve a more particular examination of them for another place, where I shall treat at length of the various readings of the text of the Gospels.*

“There are strong reasons for thinking that the first two chapters of our present copies of the Greek Gospel of Matthew made no part of the original Hebrew. We may suppose them to have been an ancient document, which, from the connection of the subject with his history, was transcribed into the same volume with it, and which, though first written as a distinct work, with some mark of separation, yet in process of time became blended with it, so as apparently to form its commencement. Being thus found incorporated with the Gospel in the manuscript, or in manuscripts, used by the translator, it was rendered by him as part of the original.

“There are two other passages in our Greek Gospel of Matthew, which I have remarked upon in the Additional Note just referred to in the margin, and which, as it seems to me, there is much reason for regarding as interpolated. These passages are the narrative concerning Judas in the twenty-seventh chapter, beginning with the third and ending with the tenth verse, and the account of the raising of the bodies of many saints at the time of our Saviour’s crucifixion, in the latter part of the fifty-second verse, and the fifty-third, of the same chapter.

“In respect to Mark’s Gospel, there is ground for believing that the last twelve verses were not written by the Evangelist, but were added by some other writer to supply a short

* See Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. Additional Note A. Section V.

conclusion to the work, which some cause had prevented the author from completing.

“In Luke’s Gospel, the only passage of any considerable length or importance, the genuineness of which appears to me liable to suspicion, consists of the forty-third and forty-fourth verses of the twenty-second chapter, containing an account of the descent of an angel to Jesus, and of his agony and bloody sweat.

“In John’s Gospel, what now stands as the conclusion, the latter part of the twenty-fourth verse, and the twenty-fifth, of the last chapter, has the air of an editorial note. As such, it was, I think, probably distinguished when first written, though this distinction was afterwards neglected by transcribers.

“In the Received Text of this Gospel there are likewise two other passages to be considered. The genuineness of the last clause of the third and the whole of the fourth verse of the fifth chapter, which contain an account of the descent of an angel into the pool of Bethesda, is very questionable; and the story of the woman taken in adultery is, in my opinion, justly regarded by a majority of modern critics as not having been a part of the original Gospel.

“The two passages last mentioned, and the other *interpolations* that have been suggested, that is, the two insertions into the body of the text of the original Hebrew of Matthew’s Gospel, and one into that of Luke’s Gospel, were, we may suppose, first written as notes or additional matter in the margin of some copies of the Gospel in which they are found. But passages belonging to the text of a work, which had been accidentally omitted by a transcriber, were, likewise, often preserved in the margin. From this circumstance, notes and additional matter, thus written, were not unfrequently

mistaken for parts of the text, and introduced by a subsequent copier into what he thought their proper place. This is a fruitful source of various readings in ancient writings; and may explain how the passages in question, if not genuine, have become incorporated with the text of the Gospels.

“The facts that have been mentioned, respecting doubtful or spurious passages in the text of the Gospels, imply nothing opposite to the general proposition maintained. On the contrary, in reasoning concerning those passages, we go upon the supposition of its truth. It is assumed, that the Gospels, generally speaking, have been faithfully preserved; but it is contended, that there are particular reasons for doubting whether one or another of the passages in question, though found in many or in all the extant manuscripts of a Gospel, proceeded from the pen of the Evangelist. These reasons are specific, applying in every case to the particular passage under consideration, and not admitting of a general application. They suppose no new theory respecting the corruption of the Gospels, and no habit in transcribers of making unlicensed alterations. They imply nothing more than the operation of particular accidents, producing error in particular cases; the possibility of which none will deny. All that we can say respecting any ancient work is, that it remains *essentially* the same as it was originally composed. For specific reasons, applying to some particular passage, we may doubt whether it proceeded from the pen of the Evangelist. But, unless the Gospels were exposed to some *peculiar* causes of corruption, there can be no question that, generally speaking, we have satisfactory means of determining the original text of the last three Gospels, and that of the Greek translation of Matthew; the number of authorities for settling it, manuscripts, ancient versions, and

quotations by ancient writers, being far more numerous and important than those for settling the text of any other ancient writing." — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, I. 23 – 30.

"WHEN attention was first strongly directed to the number of various readings *upon the Received Text* of the New Testament, and the critical edition of Mill was published, which was said to contain thirty thousand,* two classes of individuals were very differently affected. Some sincerely religious men, among whom was Whitby, who wrote expressly against the labors of Mill, were apprehensive that the whole text of the New Testament, the foundation of our faith, would be unsettled; while the infidels of the age, among whom Collins was prominent, were ready, with other feelings, to adopt the same opinion. The whole number of various readings of the text of the New Testament that have hitherto been noted exceeds a hundred thousand, and may, perhaps, amount to a hundred and fifty thousand.

"But this number is, I presume, less in proportion than that of the various readings extant upon most classic authors, when compared with the quantity of text examined, and the number of manuscripts and other authorities collated in each particular case.† How such an amount of various readings exists upon the

"* That is to say, thirty thousand variations from the Received Text. But when the Received Text varies from other authorities, its readings should also be considered as various readings of the text of the New Testament. Including these, therefore, Mill's edition presents about sixty thousand various readings."

"† Bentley, in his 'Remarks on Free-thinking,' in answer to Collins, says:—

text of ancient works, we may understand, when we consider what every one who has had experience on the subject is aware of, that no written copy of an exemplar of any considerable length, if made only with ordinary care, is without variations and errors. Notwithstanding the extreme care which has in some cases been taken, it is doubtful whether even a printed

“ ‘ Terence is now in one of the best conditions of any of the classic writers; the oldest and best copy of him is now in the Vatican library, which comes nearest to the poet’s own hand; but even that has hundreds of errors, most of which may be mended out of other exemplars, that are otherwise more recent and of inferior value. I myself have collated several, and do affirm that I have seen twenty thousand various lections in that little author, not near so big as the whole New Testament; and am morally sure, that, if half the number of manuscripts were collated for Terence with that niceness and minuteness which has been used in twice as many for the New Testament, the number of the variations would amount to above fifty thousand.

“ ‘ In the manuscripts of the New Testament, the variations have been noted with a religious, not to say superstitious, exactness. Every difference in spelling, in the smallest particle or article of speech, in the very order or collocation of words, without real change, has been studiously registered. Nor has the text only been ransacked, but all the ancient versions, the Latin Vulgate, Italic, Syriac, Æthiopic, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, Gothic, and Saxon; nor these only, but all the dispersed citations of the Greek and Latin Fathers in a course of five hundred years. What wonder, then, if, with all this scrupulous search in every hole and corner, the varieties rise to thirty thousand? when, in all ancient books of the same bulk, whereof the manuscripts are numerous, the variations are as many or more, and yet no versions to swell the reckoning.

“ ‘ The editors of profane authors do not use to trouble their readers,

book exists which corresponds throughout to its proposed archetype, or which, in other words, is wholly free from *errata*. There is no hazard in saying that the variations in the printed copies of King James's version of the Bible, such variations as are noted in the manuscripts of the New Testament, are to be reckoned by thousands; and if, as in the case of the Greek text of the New Testament, we were to take the quotations of different writers into account, by tens of thousands. But in producing copies by transcription, the number of errors resulting will be vastly greater than in producing the same number of copies by the press; since far more liability to error will

or risk their own reputation, by an useless list of every small slip committed by a lazy or ignorant scribe. What is thought commendable in an edition of Scripture, and has the name of fairness and fidelity, would in them be deemed impertinence and trifling. Hence the reader not versed in ancient manuscripts is deceived into an opinion, that there were no more variations in the copies than what the editor has communicated. Whereas, if the like scrupulousness was observed in registering the smallest changes in profane authors, as is allowed, nay required, in sacred, the now formidable number of thirty thousand would appear a very trifle.

“ ‘It is manifest that books in verse are not near so obnoxious to variations as those in prose; the transcriber, if he is not wholly ignorant and stupid, being guided by the measures, and hindered from such alterations as do not fall in with the laws of numbers. And yet even in poets the variations are so very many as can hardly be conceived without use and experience. In the late edition of Tibullus by the learned Mr. Broukhuse, you have a register of various lections in the close of that book; where you may see at the first view that they are as many as the lines. The same is visible in Plautus set out by Pareus. I myself, during my travels, have had the opportunity to examine several manuscripts of the poet Manilius;

exist in the case of every particular copy transcribed, than exists in regard to a whole edition of printed copies. With these general views, it is not necessary to dwell on the particular causes of mistakes and errors in ancient manuscripts, which are more numerous than may at first thought be supposed. They have been often pointed out by different writers.

“I proceed, then, to observe, that, of the various readings of the New Testament, nineteen out of twenty, at least, are to be dismissed at once from consideration, — not on account of their intrinsic unimportance, — that is a separate consideration, — but because they are found in so few authorities,

and can assure you that the variations I have met with are twice as many as all the lines of the book.’ — pp. 93 – 95, 8th Edition.

“To take a few books immediately at hand, I perceive by a loose computation from a table at the end of Wakefield’s *Lucretius*, that he has collected about twelve thousand various readings of that author (exclusive of mere differences of orthography), from five printed copies only. Weiske’s edition of *Longinus* presents more than three thousand various readings of the *Treatise on the Sublime*, a work of about the length of the Gospel of Mark, collected from eight manuscripts and two early editions. And Bekker has published *variations from his text* of the writings contained in his edition of *Plato*, which fill seven hundred and seventy-eight crowded octavo pages, and amount to I know not how many more than sixty thousand; the manuscripts used on each of the different writings being on an average about thirteen. The various readings of the New Testament, it is to be remembered, have been collected from a very great number of manuscripts of the original, from manuscripts of numerous ancient versions, in which it is not to be supposed that the translator always rendered in a manner scrupulously literal, and also from the citations of a long series of Fathers, who, we know, were commonly not attentive to verbal accuracy in quoting.”

and their origin is so easily explained, that no critic would regard them as having any claim to be inserted in the text. Of those which remain, a very great majority are entirely unimportant. They consist in different modes of spelling; in different tenses of the same verb, or different cases of the same noun, not affecting the essential meaning; in the use of the singular for the plural, or the plural for the singular, where one or the other expression is equally suitable; in the insertion or omission of particles, such as *αὐ* and *δέ*, not affecting the sense, or of the article in cases equally unimportant; in the introduction of a proper name, where, if not inserted, the personal pronoun is to be understood, or of some other word or words expressive of a sense which would be distinctly implied without them; in the addition of 'Jesus' to 'Christ,' or 'Christ' to 'Jesus'; in the substitution of one synonymous or equivalent term for another; in the transposition of words, leaving their signification the same; in the use of an uncompounded verb, or of the same verb compounded with a preposition, the latter differing from the former, if at all, only in a shade of meaning; and in a few short passages, liable to the suspicion of having been copied into the Gospel where we find them from some other Evangelist. Such various readings, and others equally unimportant, compose far the greater part of all concerning which there may be, or has been, a question whether they are to be admitted into the text or not; and it is therefore of no consequence in which way the question has been, or may be, determined.

“ But after deducting from the whole amount of various readings, first those of no authority, and next those of no importance, a number will remain which are objects of a certain degree of curiosity and interest. To three of them an extravagant importance has been attached, from their supposed bearing

upon the theological doctrine of the Trinity. But the principal of these, the famous passage in the First Epistle of John (v. 7), is a manifest interpolation. In the case of this and of most other passages, where the true reading is a matter of any interest, we may commonly arrive at a satisfactory judgment concerning it; and in regard to the cases in which we cannot, it is clear that no opinion, nor any inference whatever, respecting the meaning of the writer, is to be founded on an *uncertain* reading.

“The Received Text, as it has been called, of the New Testament, that is, the text which for almost two centuries, till after the time of Griesbach, was found with little variation in the common editions of the New Testament, was formed during the sixteenth century, with comparatively few helps, and in the exercise of no great critical judgment. But the chief value of the immense amount of labor which has since been expended upon the text of the New Testament does not consist in its having effected improvements in the Received Text. Its chief and great value consists in establishing the fact, that the text of the New Testament has been transmitted to us with remarkable integrity; that far the greater part of the variations among different copies are of no authority or of no importance; and that it is a matter scarcely worth consideration, as regards the study of our religion and its history, whether, after making a very few corrections, we take the Received Text formed as it was, or the very best which the most laborious and judicious criticism might produce.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. Additional Note A, Section III. pp. xxxv. — xl.

For illustration of these statements see what follows the passage just quoted, pp. xl. — xlv. See also the Appendix to Vol. I. of the present work.

II.

ON THE CORRESPONDENCES AMONG THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

THIS subject is fully discussed in the Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. Additional Note D, pp. cvi. – ccxiii. A portion of the “Concluding Remarks” may here be quoted.

“It has been my purpose to show, that, when we consider the agreements and differences among the first three Gospels, we find their character to be such as cannot be accounted for by the supposition, that the Evangelists copied either one from another, or all from common written documents. Some common archetype, however, they must have had; the corresponding passages which we find in them, if they did not previously exist in a determinate written form, must have existed orally in forms nearly resembling those which they now present; and this supposition of a model, partly fixed, by a regard to truth and by frequent repetition, and partly fluctuating, through the changes of oral narration, is the only one that accounts satisfactorily for the phenomena presented.

“But the narratives which the Evangelists have thus transmitted to us were the original accounts of the Apostles and first preachers of Christianity. This appears from the accordance of the Gospels with each other in the view which they present of the marvellous character and ministry of Christ. Accounts so wonderful, especially if one fancy them unfounded in truth, would have been distorted in many different ways, with or without some dishonest purpose, if abandoned to oral

tradition, floating through different countries, and received and transmitted by thousands of new converts. We cannot suppose, that, after the apostolic age, three unconnected writers, founding their narratives upon oral accounts alone, would have harmonized together as do the three Evangelists.* The agreement and difference among these Gospels present a very extraordinary, or rather a unique phenomenon, which requires a peculiar cause for its solution, and this cause is, I think, to be found only in the fact, that they were all based upon unwritten narratives, which had, as yet, lost nothing of their original character; and which, therefore, were the narratives, true or false, of the first preachers of the religion.

“In reading those Gospels, therefore, we are in effect listening to the very words of the Apostles; we are, if I may so speak, introduced into their presence, to receive their testimony concerning deeds and words which they affirm that they saw and heard, and miracles of such a character that it would be idle to suppose them deceived or mistaken in their reports. The question, then, concerning the truth of Christianity, under this aspect of its evidences, lies within a narrow compass. Realize, as far as you can, the characters and circumstances of the Apostles; place yourself, in imagination, in their presence, attend to their testimony, and search for every motive and feeling that might lead them, all in common, at the hazard of every worldly good, to persist in asserting the truth of stories, which they knew, and thousands of their hearers knew, and all might know, to be false. Just so far as any probable motive may be assigned for such conduct, just so far, and no further, may the truth of Christianity be rendered doubtful.”

* See Genuineness of the Gospels, I. 176, seqq.

III.

ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS AND THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

“It deserves observation, that, with the exception of the history of the last days of our Saviour’s life, the accounts of his ministry in the first three Evangelists relate to events which took place either in Galilee, or elsewhere, at a distance from Jerusalem. With this part of his ministry the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the strangers who resorted there, being least acquainted, the Apostles would be most frequently called upon to give information respecting it.

“In accounting for the resemblance among the first three Gospels, we are led to consider the difference between them and the Gospel of John. To explain it, we may observe, that this Gospel is not properly a history of the ministry of Jesus. It supposes that history, as recorded in the first three Gospels, to be already known; it is founded upon it, and supplementary to it. It relates principally to what took place at Jerusalem, where our Saviour spent but a small portion of his ministry. It consists, in great part, of connected discourses of Jesus with the unbelieving Jews, and with his Apostles, of which much has special and immediate reference only to the character and circumstances of those immediately addressed. It did not, like the narrative contained in the first three Gospels, constitute that elementary instruction in the history of Jesus, which was the first want of the converts to the new religion. Like the Epistles of the Apostles, it implies that this had been already received.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. Additional Note D, Section IV. p. clxxvi, seq., note.

IV.

ON THE DATE OF THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

“IF,” as has been shown, “the Evangelists did not copy one from another, it follows, that the first three Gospels must all have been written about the same period; since, if one had preceded another by any considerable length of time, it cannot be supposed that the author of the later Gospel would have been unacquainted with the work of his predecessor, or would have neglected to make use of it; especially when we take into view, that its reputation must have been well established among Christians. Whatever antiquity, therefore, we can show to belong to any one of the first three Gospels, the same, or nearly the same, we may ascribe to the other two. Now Luke, in the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles, speaks of his Gospel in terms which imply that this work had been completed but a little while before; and in the Acts he brings down the history to the end of the second year of Paul’s residence at Rome, which was some time after the sixtieth year of our era. According, likewise, to the remarks formerly made respecting the Gospel of Mark,* it was probably written about the year 65, when St. Peter is supposed to have suffered martyrdom at Rome. We may conclude, therefore, that no one of the first three Gospels was written long before or long after the year 60.” † — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. Additional Note D, Section V. p. clxxxviii, seq.

* See *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. lxxix, seq.

† [The following account is given by Irenæus, who flourished in the

V.

ON THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

"WE believe that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, meaning by that term the common language of the Jews of his time, because such is the uniform statement of all ancient writers who advert to the subject. To pass over others whose authority is of less weight, he is affirmed to have written in Hebrew by Papias,* Irenæus,† Origen,‡ Eusebius,§ and Jerome; || nor does any ancient author advance a contrary opinion. This testimony is of the more weight, because, if there had been any prejudice on the subject, it would have operated against the common belief, as the prejudices of modern Chris-

latter part of the second century: — "Matthew among the Hebrews published a Gospel in their own language; while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel at Rome, and founding a church there. And after their departure [death], Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself delivered to us in writing what Peter had preached; and Luke, the companion of Paul, recorded the Gospel preached by him. Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who leaned upon his breast, likewise published a Gospel, while he dwelt at Ephesus in Asia." — *Contra Hæres. Lib. III. c. 1*, — as quoted in the *Genuineness of the Gospels*, I. 131.]

* Apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles. Lib. III. c. 39*.

† *Contra Hæres. Lib. III. c. 1*.

‡ Apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles. Lib. VI. c. 25*.

§ *Hist. Eccles. Lib. III. c. 24. Quæstiones ad Marinum, ap. Maii Scriptorum Veterum Nov. Collect. Tom. I. p. 64*.

"|| The fact is stated or implied by Jerome in passages so numerous, that it is not worth while to refer to them particularly."

tians have done. It would have led the great body of ancient Gentile Christians, from whom we receive the account, to prefer considering their Greek Gospel of Matthew as the original, not as a translation.

“If we will not, then, reject the testimony of all Christian antiquity to a simple fact, in which there is no intrinsic improbability, we must believe that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. Nothing has been objected to that testimony which I can regard as of sufficient force to justify a protracted discussion. On the contrary, it is confirmed by the corresponding evidence of the Fathers, that the Hebrew original of Matthew was in common use (either in a pure or corrupt form) among Jewish Christians.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. Additional Note A, Section IV. p. xlv, seq.

For further remarks, see what follows the passage just quoted, pp. xlvi. – lv.

“The Gospel of Matthew was probably translated into Greek some time about the close of the first century. The verbal coincidences of its translation with the Gospels of Mark and Luke admit of one, and I think only one, satisfactory solution. The original of Matthew agreed with them essentially in many narratives and many sayings and discourses of Christ. These, or portions of these, were the same, except their expression in different languages, and the manner of their expression in the Greek language had been fixed by the Greek Gospels of Mark and Luke. But these Gospels being known to the translator of Matthew, when his original corresponded with them sufficiently, he was led to adopt their expressions.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. Additional Note D, Section IV. p. clxxix, seq.

Respecting the Greek translation of Matthew, see also *Genuineness of the Gospels*, I. 90 – 92.

N O T E S

ON

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

NOTES ON THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

FOR the first two chapters ascribed to Matthew, see Appendix, Note A.

III. 1. “In the days of Herod appeared John the Baptist, preaching in the Desert of Judæa.”

With this chapter and the parallel passages compare John i. 19 – 34, and on the office of John the Baptist see the note on Matthew xi. 2 – 6.

See also the account of John the Baptist given by Josephus. Antiq. Jud. Lib. XVIII. c. 5. § 2.

The Desert of Judæa lay on the west of the Dead Sea and of the Jordan.

2. “Reform ; for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand.”

‘Reform,’ — it is thus that the word in the original, *Μετανοεῖτε*, should be rendered, and not ‘Repent,’ as it is in the Common Version. The primary idea expressed by *repentance* is merely sorrow for one’s past conduct ; the primary idea expressed by *reformation* is a change from a bad moral state to a

good one.* It was the necessity of the latter, and not of the former, except so far as the former is connected with the latter, that John meant to inculcate. — For further remarks, see Appendix, Note C, p. 503, seq.

On the meaning of the phrase “the kingdom of Heaven” see the note on ch. iv. 17.

3. “*A voice is crying in the desert, Prepare the way of the LORD, make his road straight.*”

Compare Mark i. 2, 3; Luke i. 17, 76; iii. 4–6; John i. 23. See also Matthew xi. 10; Luke vii. 27. In these passages John the Baptist, the precursor of Christ, is represented as a messenger going before Jehovah to prepare his way and announce his coming. But this admits of an easy explanation.

“In conformity to the rude apprehensions of the Jews, we often find in the Bible, particularly in the Old Testament, strong, and, in themselves considered, harsh figures applied to God, which are borrowed from the properties, passions, and actions of man, and even of the inferior animals. Among them is the common figure by which God, in giving any pecu-

* “Reformation (*μετάνοια*),” says Philo, “holds the second place after perfectness, as recovery from sickness is the next best thing to uninterrupted health.” — De Abrabamo. Opp. II. 5, ed. Mang. This passage is copied by Clement of Alexandria. Pædagog. Lib. I. c. 9. Opp. p. 146, ed. Potter.

Tertullian, remarking on the difference between the repentance of God spoken of in the Scriptures, and the repentance of man, observes: — “Nam et in Græco sono, pœnitentiæ nomen non ex delicti confessione, sed ex animi demutatione comparatum est.” — Adv. Marcion. Lib. II. c. 24.

liar manifestation of his power, is represented as changing his place, and coming to the scene where his power is displayed. But if we except the case of miraculous operations exerted directly upon the minds of men, the power of God must be manifested by means of sensible objects. It is often represented as exerted through the agency of human beings and other conscious ministers of his will. When thus exerted, its effects, and the circumstances by which its display is attended, are sometimes referred to God as the ultimate cause, and sometimes to the immediate agent. What is said in one case to be done by an angel, or by Moses, or by Christ, or by some other instrument of God's will, is in another case said to be done by God. The power displayed is regarded, according to different modes of conceiving the same thing, as appertaining to him or to them. God comes, according to the language of Scripture, when a commissioned instrument of his will appears; and the precursor of the latter is the precursor of God." — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 186, 187.

9. "Think not to say to yourselves, We have Abraham for our father."

There are many passages of the Rabbins from which it appears, that they believed that the descendants of Abraham would be saved hereafter through his merits, and that he would deliver them, even if sinners, from hell (*Gehenna*); "unless," says Rabbi Levi, "they have sinned beyond measure." See Wetstein's note.* Compare John viii. 33, 39, 53.

* [So Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 25. p. 185, ed. Thirlb.) speaks of the Jews as "those who esteem themselves righteous, and

The Jews, John teaches, had no claim upon God on account of their descent from Abraham. The privileges which they thought themselves entitled to on this account, God might bestow on whom he would, whether natural descendants of Abraham or not.

10. "And even now the axe is lying at the root of the trees."

The conception is of one laying his axe at the root of a tree, while preparing to cut it down. I transpose the two clauses of this verse, in order to render their meaning and connection more obvious than it would otherwise be in a translation.

11. "He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire."

When John says, "He will baptize you *in* the Holy Spirit and *in* fire," we must recollect that the ancient mode of baptizing was by plunging into water. The meaning of these words is, that Christ would come as the dispenser of spiritual

say that they are Abraham's children," οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς καὶ λέγοντες εἶναι τέκνα Ἀβραάμ; and tells them that they "deceive themselves in supposing that, because they are the natural offspring of Abraham, they will certainly inherit the blessings which God has promised to confer through the Messiah." (Ibid. c. 44. p. 225.) In another passage he speaks of the Jewish teachers as deluding themselves and their countrymen, "imagining that the eternal kingdom will certainly be given to those who are the offspring of Abraham by natural descent, though they may be sinful, unbelieving, and disobedient to God." (Ibid. c. 140. pp. 433, 434.) See also c. 125, ad fin. p. 407.]

blessings, in which those who received him would be, as it were, baptized, while they who rejected those blessings would be destroyed, baptized in fire.

In the original there is a metaphor in this and the following verse, which cannot be preserved in a translation. The word rendered 'Spirit' also means *wind*, and, except that the literal meaning would be unintelligible in English, we might translate, "He will baptize you in a holy wind." There is an allusion to the wind in which grain was winnowed.

12. "For he will come prepared for winnowing."

The Common Version says, "Whose *fan* is in his hand"; but no idea of the implement intended is conveyed to an English reader by the word 'fan.' This implement was a fork with several prongs, used, after the grain had been trodden out from the straw, to throw up the mingled heap against the wind, that the chaff might be blown away, and thus separated. (See Wetstein's note.) No such tool being known to modern readers, and we, therefore, having no name for it, I have given the sense of the passage in general terms.

15. "For thus must we do to accomplish all that is right."

That is, my baptism by you is proper, in order to the effectual performance of your office and mine. The word ἡμῶν in the plural must refer to both John and Jesus.

16. "And as soon as Jesus was baptized and

came out of the water, lo! the heavens were opened to John."

"Of these words, the most probable meaning is, that the firmament appeared to open, and light to shine from the depths of heaven. Livy (Lib. XXII. c. 1), in describing a supposed phenomenon of a similar kind, says that the 'heaven appeared to be rent with a wide chasm, and where it was opened, a great light shone forth.' I quote this passage to show what conceptions were probably connected with the expression, 'the heavens were opened,' as it occurs in the Evangelists." — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, 1st Ed., I. 217, 218, note.

See Origen against Celsus, Lib. I. cc. 41–47. Opp. I. p. 357, seqq., particularly p. 365.

17. "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased."

Here may be explained the title "Son of God" as applied to Christ.

"The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 5) quotes the words which God in the Old Testament is represented to have used concerning Solomon, as applicable to Christ: 'I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son.'* By these words was meant, that God would distinguish Solomon with

* [2 Samuel vii. 14 ; compare 1 Chronicles xvii. 13 ; xxviii. 6. The same term is applied to the Israelites collectively, as the chosen people of God, Exodus xv. 22, "Israel is my son, my first-born", and Hosea xi. 1, "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt."]

peculiar favors; would treat him as a father treats a son; and they are to be understood in a similar manner when applied to Christ. ‘We beheld,’ says St. John in his Gospel (i. 14), ‘his glory, glory like that of an only son from a father’;* that is, we beheld the glorious powers and offices conferred upon him, by which he was distinguished from all others, as an only son is distinguished by his father. It is in reference to this analogy, and probably, I think, to this very passage in his Gospel, that St. John elsewhere calls Christ ‘the only Son of God,’ a title applied to him by no other writer of the New Testament. †

“But the title was also familiarly used to denote those qualities which recommend moral beings to the favor of God; those which bear such a likeness to his moral attributes as may be compared with the likeness which a son has to his father; those which constitute one, in the Oriental style, to be of the family of God. Thus our Saviour exhorts his disciples to do good to their enemies, that they may be ‘sons of their Father in heaven.’ ‡ Nor is this use of the term confined to the

“* *Ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός.* These words should not be rendered, as in the Common Version, ‘We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.’ To justify this rendering, both *μονογενοῦς* and *πατρός* should have the article.”

“† There is a doubt whether the words, John iii. 16 – 21, in which this title occurs, are to be considered as the language of Christ or of the Evangelist. If St. John intended to ascribe them to Christ, he has probably clothed the ideas of his Master in his own language; and we may so account for the use of a title in this passage, which Christ never elsewhere applies to himself.”

‡ *Υιοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν*, Matthew v. 45; compare Luke vi. 35.

Scriptures. Philo urges him who is not 'yet worthy to be called a son of God' to aim at higher excellence.*

"In reference to both these analogies, the term was pre-eminently applicable to Christ; and he was therefore called by others, and by himself, 'THE Son of God,' the article being used, as often, to denote pre-eminence." † — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 155 – 157.

[The title "Son of God" appears to have been in common use among the Jews in the time of Christ as a designation of the expected Messiah. This application of it was probably founded in part on their interpretation of Psalm ii. 7, 12, and lxxxix. 26, 27; compare Hebrews i. 5, 6; v. 5. Thus Nathanael says, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God, you are the king of Israel"; and Martha, "I believe that you are the Messiah, the Son of God, he who was to come into the world." (John i. 49; xi. 27.) See also Matthew xvi. 16, 20, compare Mark viii. 29, Luke ix. 20; — Matthew xxvi. 63, compare Mark xiv. 61, Luke xxii. 67, 70; — John xx. 31; Acts ix. 20, 22; 1 John v 1, 4, 5.]

* De Confusione Linguarum. Opp. I. 427. — *Διὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα υἱοὶ ἐκείνου εἶναι λογισθέντες*, "through likeness to God accounted to be his sons," is an expression in the Clementine Homilies, X. § 6.

† The words ascribed (Luke i. 32) to the angel who foretold to Mary the birth of Christ, are sometimes quoted as explanatory of the title 'Son of God,' with reference to his miraculous conception. I believe, however, these words to mean: 'He shall be great; and he shall be [*not* shall be called] a son of the Most High'; *καλεῖσθαι* being equivalent to *εἶναι*, as in other passages. We find the same expression in Psalm lxxxii. 6. In verse 35, *διό*, rendered in the Common Version 'therefore,' may be understood as meaning, 'whence it may be inferred,' 'conformably to which,' 'so that.'"

IV. 1-11. "Then was Jesus led by the Spirit into the Desert, to be tempted by the Devil. . . . Then the Devil left him, and lo! angels came and ministered to him."

Compare Mark i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1-13.

It is, I conceive, unnecessary to dwell on the considerations which make it evident that the account given in the passages of the Evangelists referred to above is not to be understood literally. This fact being recognized, there have been various attempts to explain it otherwise. What seems to me the most plausible explanation to be gathered from these attempts may be thus stated.

The account of the Evangelists must have been derived from Jesus himself; since the events spoken of are represented as passing while he was in solitude, before any disciples had joined him. It is to be regarded as a figurative description of the thoughts necessarily suggested to him, especially at the commencement of his ministry, by the circumstances in which he was placed and the powers which he possessed. This he addressed to his disciples for their instruction and warning. Endued as he was with miraculous powers, he was not to use them for the purpose of supplying his own necessities, as by turning stones into bread, when hungry;—nor for vain display, as if he were to cast himself from the roof of the temple, and be supported in mid-air before astonished multitudes;—nor for the purposes of ambition, as if he were to assume the character of the Jewish Messiah, the prince who was to subdue all kingdoms to his power. Yet the circumstances which would suggest such a use of his powers could not fail to present themselves to his mind while meditating in solitude, at the com-

mencement of his ministry, on the scenes and duties on which he was just about to enter. Those circumstances considered in themselves were spoken of by our Lord as temptations, without reference to any supposed influence of them to excite irregular desires in his own mind. On the contrary, he represented all suggestions to use his miraculous powers for the accomplishment of any selfish purpose as being indignantly rejected by him. He figuratively ascribed them to Satan, the great author, as the Jews imagined, of moral evil. He did this to convey to his disciples in the most impressive manner his abhorrence of the thought of yielding to such suggestions, and his deep sense of its guilt. His object in the whole representation appears to have been to excite the same feelings in them. They were to be brought to the same state of mind with himself. Being also endued with miraculous powers, they also were to regard any suggestion to take advantage of them, directly or indirectly, for any selfish purpose, as if it were a suggestion proceeding immediately from him whom the Jews conceived of as the great enemy of God and man. It was likewise the purpose of our Lord to teach them, that they must hope to procure from him no worldly advantages ; that, though he was the Son of God, with at least equal powers to those which were attributed by the Jews to their expected Messiah, yet these powers were not to be exercised for his own worldly advancement, or for theirs. It was his intention to eradicate from their minds, and from those of others, their false expectations respecting the Messiah.

The whole narrative is an allegory. It may be compared to the famous allegory of the choice of Hercules, in which Pleasure and Virtue are represented as appearing to him at the commencement of his course, and each soliciting him to

become her follower. The thoughts that rose before the mind of Jesus were thoughts of evil, of acting in opposition to the will of God; and we may reasonably believe that here, as elsewhere, he conformed his language to the popular conceptions of the Jews concerning Satan, and, in order to stamp those thoughts at once with their true character, represented them as suggested by him. According to those conceptions, Satan was moral evil hypostatized, the adversary of God and man; and nothing could express to the mind of a Jew a stronger reprobation of any action, or course of conduct, than to describe it as resulting from his instigation.

THIS explanation, I doubt not, contains much truth, and may appear, at first view, admissible. What we find in the Evangelists must have been founded on a discourse of our Lord; the personification of Satan is satisfactorily explained, in conformity to his use of language elsewhere, and the purpose of his discourse probably corresponded in some degree to the purpose ascribed to it in what has been said.

But the explanation is essentially defective in not assigning any reason why the Evangelists do not mention or intimate that they are reporting a discourse of our Lord, why they give no account of the occasion of such a discourse, and why, consequently, they furnish no key for understanding it allegorically, but, without indicating the source of their information, appear as if they were relating a narrative from their personal knowledge. The solution proposed does not extend to various obvious difficulties. It affords no account of our Lord's supposed fast of forty days, a fast incredible as a natural event, and scarcely more credible if regarded as supernatural, since, in the latter case, no reason can be assigned for it with an appearance of

likelihood. The account of it cannot be allegorical, and thus connected with the allegorical interpretation of the rest of the supposed narrative; and nothing is said to bring it within the limits of probability if taken as a literal statement.

On further examination, other objections to the proposed explanation become apparent. According to the representation given by the Evangelists, our Lord was carried into the Desert by the impulse of the Spirit of God, to be tempted or tried. In the explanation suggested, thoughts of evil, — thoughts of acting contrary to the will of God, — are supposed to have presented themselves to his imagination. But the admission into his mind, even for a moment, of such evil thoughts, and especially their assuming for him the guise of a temptation, are suppositions wholly incongruous with his character. According to the explanation itself, he repelled them at once with strong abhorrence. There was, then, no trial, no temptation. Our Lord could not be tempted to do what was abhorrent to his nature, and what he recognized as so sinful that (to use the conceptions and language of his countrymen) the mere imagination of it was to be ascribed to Satan.

But the thoughts which are supposed to have constituted our Lord's temptation were not only sinful thoughts, but suggestions of mere impossibilities, — suggestions to misuse what we call his miraculous power in opposition to the purposes of God. But this power was the power of God alone. A miracle is an evident suspension of the ordinary operations of God in the government of the universe, and the substitution by him of other modes of action in their place. The power of working miracles cannot, therefore, be transferred to any inferior being, and used to counteract his will. The miraculous power which in popular language we ascribe to Jesus, or to any other

messenger of God, is only the power of God displayed in his cause, — employed to authenticate his mission. Our Lord could not have represented himself, in the manner supposed, as having been tempted to commit impossible acts contrary to the will of God. We cannot allow that such thoughts may have existed in his mind; and even if it be imagined that it might be so, it is not credible that he should have given an account of them in so enigmatical an allegory, as constituting a temptation.

Other explanations have been proposed. It has been suggested that the events related occurred not in reality, but in a supernatural vision. But if our Lord had intended to give an account of a vision, he would have said so, and the Evangelists would have recorded the fact in plain words. This explanation likewise, if it could be admitted, would only relieve the supposed narrative of one essential objection, namely, the representation of the real presence and agency of Satan. Another supposition, almost too improbable to be mentioned, has been, that by Satan was meant a man whom certain members of the Jewish Sanhedrim, who had begun to suspect that Jesus was the Messiah, sent to tempt him and seduce him to join their party.

All these attempts being rejected, another solution of the story has been proposed by some modern German commentators, which they regard as final and satisfactory, namely, that it is, as one writer says, “a mythos, that is, a legend springing up freely from the religious ideas of the age”; or, according to another, “a mythos,” that is, a fable, “which the Evangelists believed to be true and represented as such,” but which “had its origin in the ideas of the Jews respecting the antagonism between the Messiah and the Devil.” Thus it is supposed that we are

relieved from the necessity of further inquiry, it being idle to attempt to explain the details of an extravagant fable in conformity with fact or truth. The knot which cannot be untied is cut.

But no escape from the difficulties with which we are embarrassed is to be thus effected. The solution last mentioned cannot be accepted. Without urging its inconsistency with our belief as Christians, there are decisive reasons for its rejection.

It proceeds on the vague notion, that the strange fiction (as according to this theory it must be regarded) adopted by the Evangelists sprung up spontaneously, as it were, by a sort of equivocal generation, from the conceptions of the Jews, that is, of Jewish Christians, concerning Satan and the Messiah. Considering that this supposed myth or fable has been incorporated into three of the Gospels, and has come down to us as a universal, uncontradicted tradition, it cannot be doubted that it had attained its full growth in the apostolic age. This follows equally from another consideration. It must have been the product of Jewish Christians, and it cannot be supposed that it was invented by them after the destruction of Jerusalem. Certainly during the subsequent period there were none of their number who had at once the disposition and the ability to give currency to the senseless fabrication among the great body of Gentile Christians. To them it had nothing to recommend it, and it is through them that we have received it. I say senseless fabrication, for such it was on the theory we are examining.

The vague, metaphorical language of the solution under consideration must not disguise from us its real unmeaningness. It presents a comparison between the growth of the supposed fiction and that of a plant, springing up in a favorable soil,

from seed which had been buried during a preceding period. But if the apparent narrative be without foundation in truth, it must have been the invention, for some purpose or other, of one or more individuals. This evidently appears from the circumstance that it purports to relate facts which could have been known, originally, to our Lord alone, and which those who put it forth were well aware that they had not been informed of by him. The proffered explanation, then, supposes that, within forty years after the death of Christ, an absurd fable concerning him was invented and propagated by some Jewish convert or converts, and through their influence obtained general reception among the Gentile converts, with whose prejudices or previous conceptions it had no accordance. It follows, that, if not invented, it was countenanced and accredited, by those of the most authority among the Jewish Christians, the disciples and Apostles of our Lord. Such a solution cannot be admitted. It would be useless to dwell on the improbabilities, or rather the moral impossibilities, which it implies.

This last account of the passage belongs to a theory of commenting on the Gospels which has obtained in our day much currency, and which is particularly set forth by the noted German writer, Strauss. According to this theory, the narratives concerning Christ in the Gospels were founded on the previous imaginations of the Jews concerning their coming Messiah. The pre-existing Jewish legends concerning him, if one may be allowed to use that word to denote stories of expected events, were "transferred, almost all ready formed, to Jesus." What the Jews had anticipated that their Messiah would be and do, the first preachers of Christianity, the disciples of Jesus, represented him as having been and done, with the

purpose, as is to be inferred, of recommending him to their countrymen. In maintaining this theory, the Rabbinical books — or rather, not the books themselves, but the collections made from them by the few scholars who have been devoted to their study — have been searched for the purpose of discovering proofs of the coincidence between the accounts of the Evangelists and the prevailing anticipations of the Jews. The Rabbinical books contain many imaginations concerning the Messiah, but the pretended parallelism between those imaginations and the facts concerning our Lord recorded in the Gospels altogether fails. There is a thorough discordance between them. No Jewish imagination concerning the Messiah has been produced from the Talmud, or from any other book, which can be converted into a narrative of an event in our Saviour's life as related in the Gospels. Perhaps there is no narrative of the Evangelists which at first view presents more likelihood that a parallel to it may be found in the Rabbinical writings, than the passage which we are examining. But the nearest coincidences with it which have been brought forward are a story of uncertain date, found in one copy of a Jewish commentary, that Satan applied to Jehovah for leave to tempt the Messiah, and was angrily repelled, — a story which may rather seem framed in express contradiction to the supposed narrative in the Gospels, — and another from the Gemara, that Satan had a personal interview with Abraham, and endeavored to seduce him from his obedience to Jehovah, when he was on his way to perform the sacrifice of Isaac.

The theory with which this mode of explanation is connected supposes that it was the purpose of the historians and first preachers of our Lord to delude their countrymen into the belief, that he whom they had caused to be crucified as a blas-

phemous impostor had in reality answered to their expectations of a glorious Messiah. It is a theory which might appear scarcely to deserve this passing notice, were it not that it is the last, and, as far as I am informed, the only elaborate, theory of infidelity, by which an attempt has been made to explain the origin of Christianity in denying it to be a revelation from God.

IF it be true, then, that all the attempts to explain the passage both by Christians and infidels have been so unsuccessful, it would seem to follow, that some essential fact, some fundamental principle of interpretation, has been disregarded. Such I conceive to be the case. There has been a prevailing notion that the writers of the Gospels were infallible narrators. It has been maintained that their relations were not the product of their unassisted faculties, working upon such knowledge of facts as they had only human means of acquiring, but, on the contrary, that their narratives, as we call them, are in strictness of speech not theirs, but were written through the miraculous suggestion of God, or at least under such miraculous superintendence as precluded all error, except some trivial errors, which, for some reason or other, were permitted to exist. The writers of the Gospels have thus been separated from other historians by a wide distinction, and the same rules of interpretation and judgment which are applied to the latter have been considered as by no means applicable to the former. The Evangelists have been regarded as organs of God, and, consequently, as not liable like other historians to human errors, to mistakes arising from failures of memory, or from want of correct information, or from misconceptions of the meaning of language, or from the misuse of language on their own part, or

from the misunderstanding of the connection and bearing of discourses and events, or from the influence of the strong prejudices and gross errors of their age and country, or from any other source whatever, — with the exception, if it is to be made, of the occasions of those trivial errors before referred to.

This doctrine annihilates all the evidence for the genuineness and consequent credibility of these works arising from the supposed coincidences between them and the individual characters and peculiar circumstances of their writers. If they contain, properly speaking, not the words of their reputed human authors, but are to be ascribed to God himself, such coincidences cannot exist. It likewise destroys the internal evidence for the truth of their narratives from what seem the evident proofs of their incapacity to form an imagination of such a character as that of Christ, or to conceive of such a religion as he taught, had he not been such as they describe him. Such proofs of incapacity cannot exist, if their minds were miraculously illuminated and guided in writing. But the doctrine has been earnestly maintained by believers, and adopted as a ground of reasoning by unbelievers. The latter, though it is self-contradictory for them to admit the miracle which it supposes, have argued upon its assumption, and have treated the Gospels, not as the writings of human authors, but as histories the authority of which might be destroyed by proving their want of infallibility.

But the Evangelists are, I believe, to be regarded as the real, not as the instrumental, authors of the books ascribed to them. Their personal characters, their means of information, and the circumstances in which they were placed, are to be kept constantly in mind in interpreting their writings. They were uneducated Jews, men whose understandings had not

been disciplined by human instruction, nor informed by human learning; men who were liable, like others of their class, to errors of judgment and mistakes of fact on matters of merely probable knowledge. We are satisfied of their integrity of purpose, of their intention to relate nothing but the truth. It was their office to record the essential facts of the revelation of God through Jesus Christ. Of the facts in his ministry they were either personal witnesses, or received their knowledge from personal witnesses who were their companions and friends. We cannot over-estimate the weight of these considerations. One or the other, either the integrity of the Evangelists or their means of acquiring knowledge of the facts they relate, must be denied before the authenticity of their histories can be invalidated.

But important or decisive as these considerations are, they are not essential to the proof of the authenticity of the Gospels. To adapt the argument on this subject to the rash and groundless skepticism which has characterized our age, — there is no controversy, that the Gospels, whoever might be their writers, are coincident in their distinctive features with accounts of our Lord, oral or written, given by his disciples; that the history of his ministry in all its main particulars remains the same as it was when first presented to his contemporaries. Whoever related this history, in the very act of doing so, virtually appealed to the knowledge of those with whom Jesus had been conversant, to the knowledge of the inhabitants of Galilee, Peræa, and Jerusalem, as confirming its essential truth. Had the authors of those accounts of our Lord's ministry now preserved in the Gospels fabricated a body of false stories concerning extraordinary political revolutions, or a series of remarkable natural phenomena affecting the countries which

were the scene of his ministry, the attempt to gain credit for them among their contemporaries, who, being on the spot where those revolutions and phenomena were said to have occurred, knew them to be false, would not have been more impracticable or more foolish, than the attempt to gain reception for their relations concerning Jesus had not those relations been true.

But this is not the place to dwell on this topic, or others connected with it. My purpose is merely to state the truth, that, on the one hand, we have abundant evidence of the essential authenticity of the Gospels, and, on the other, that we have no ground for believing that the Evangelists were miraculously secured from those errors to which their characters and circumstances exposed them. To such errors they were particularly exposed in their few accounts of some events which either preceded the public ministry of our Lord or occurred very early in its course, and which they knew only through the relation of others.

Proceeding on these principles, we will now consider how the existence of the passage on which we are commenting may be explained, and how it is to be understood.

Conformably to what has been before said, the passage we are considering must have been founded on words of our Lord. It is mainly the report of a discourse delivered by him. But of this discourse it is evident that the Evangelists have given us but an imperfect account. As related by them, it is preceded by no introduction, no statement of the occasion on which it was delivered, nor is it accompanied by the mention of any circumstances which might elucidate its purpose. His words, in consequence, present, as I conceive, an aspect very different from what they originally bore. As uttered by him, they re-

lated, I believe, to a truth which it was often his purpose to inculcate, and which was indirectly involved in all his discourses, — to a truth which it was necessary to announce at the very commencement of his ministry, — namely, the opposition between his office and character, and the office and character of the Messiah expected by the Jews. To effect his purpose, he represented himself as tempted by Satan to do the very things which the Jews had expected that their Messiah would do, or at least might do, according to their conceptions concerning him. It was, as I have stated, a popular notion of the Jews, that temptations to sin proceeded from Satan; and our Lord, in using language founded on this idea, meant to give them the strongest impression which they were capable of receiving, of the moral evil, the opposition to God's purposes, which would characterize such actions as were in accordance with their conceptions of the expected Messiah.

I believe his words to have been uttered early in his ministry, perhaps before, perhaps immediately after, his leaving Judæa for Galilee, as mentioned in the fourth chapter of John's Gospel. They were addressed, I conceive, to men who had been excited by his miracles, and by the declarations of John the Baptist, to look upon him as their Messiah, and who were ready to profess themselves his followers, with the hope of sharing in the good things which his followers might expect. Our Lord's words were spoken to such men, it may be presumed, before those who afterwards became his Apostles had joined him, — for his Apostles were called after he had removed from Judæa into Galilee, — and we have no reason to think that any one of them was present at the delivery of this discourse. Hence we have no account of the circumstances under which it was spoken. The words of Jesus were imper-

fectly reported by those who heard them, without a distinct comprehension of their design. The striking representation which he had given was adapted to fix itself in their minds, and was repeated without being understood.

Had the occasion of his words been preserved, the narrative of it, in the style of the Evangelists, might have run somewhat in this manner:—

And some came to him, saying, Master, we believe that thou art he who was to come. We will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.

And they said, When wilt thou manifest thyself in thy kingdom and be exalted, thou and thy followers?

And he spoke a parable to them, saying, The Son of Man was in the wilderness, praying to God and fasting; and Satan came to him to tempt him, and said, Lo! thou art hungry; since thou art the Son of God [that is, the Messiah], command these stones to become loaves of bread.

WITH this supposition of circumstances, in themselves altogether probable, as the occasion of our Lord's delivering the words under examination, they hardly require any further explanation as to their essential meaning and design. He represented his character and office as being wholly contrary to the expectations which the Jews had entertained respecting their coming Messiah.

This view may be illustrated by examining the passage before us in detail.

“Man shall not live by bread alone.” The Messiah was not to use his miraculous powers to relieve his pressing necessities, and much less, therefore, to relieve his followers, as they expected, from the sufferings of poverty and want, and to raise

them to riches and earthly grandeur. He and they — according to his directions in the Sermon on the Mount — were to trust to the providence of God for their daily food, they being engaged in God's work. He and they were to live "in whatever way God might ordain."

The parable goes on to relate, that Satan tempted our Lord to throw himself from the top of the temple, and to use his miraculous powers to suspend himself in mid-air. Every one feels how unlike the miracles actually performed by him such an exhibition would have been. The supposition of his thus exhibiting himself shocks us by a sense of its incongruity with his character and his office as the messenger of God. But the Jews, as we learn from the Talmud, were accustomed to imagine miracles of a like kind, — miracles of mere foolish ostentation, many of them far more extravagant than this, — as connected with the coming of their Messiah. They were conformable to the taste and apprehensions of a rude and unenlightened people. None such were to be expected from our Lord. A miracle, as has already been observed, is a work of God alone. The being whose authority it attests as his delegate is not the agent. In such an exhibition as was imagined, it was not to be supposed that the power of God would be displayed. "It is written also, *Thou shalt not make trial of the LORD, thy God.*" The term in the original, "Thou shalt not try," or "make trial of," carries with it, as familiarly used in the Scriptures, the sense of criminal presumption.

"Again," it is said, "the Devil took him to a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world, and their glory." These words alone prove that the account before us is not an historical narrative; for, putting aside the physical

impossibility supposed in their literal meaning, there was no mountain in or near the Desert of Judæa, from the top of which one might, by the most extravagant hyperbole or misuse of language, be described as seeing all the kingdoms of the world.

But the concluding portion of the parable brings distinctly into view its real character and purpose. It implies a statement directly adverse to the most familiar and cherished expectation of the Jews respecting their Messiah. They had conceived of him as a monarch of whom their warrior king, David, was the type, who, as the head of the chosen people, was to deliver them from the tyranny of the Roman empire, "to restore" in his own person "the kingdom to Israel," and to subdue and reign over the world; and who was to remain a king on earth till the consummation of all earthly things.* Very different were the character and office of our Lord. He teaches that such a Messiah as they looked for would be a servant of Satan, not of God. The true Messiah was to do nothing for any selfish gratification, for any worldly aggrandizement of himself or his followers. His office required him to lead a life of self-renunciation and worldly abasement, which was to be ended by a death of torture, when it might seem that his course was hardly begun.

SUCH, I conceive, were the meaning and purport of this discourse of our Lord. It was a parable, contrasting his own character and office as the delegate and representative of God with what was expected by the Jews to be the character and office of their Messiah. From its striking boldness of imagery

* John xii. 34.

it fixed itself in the minds of his hearers, and of those to whom they reported it, while the occasion of its delivery, a knowledge of which was necessary to its correct explanation, was neglected and forgotten. Thus standing alone, it assumed the character of an historical narrative marvellous and incomprehensible.

BUT this supposed narrative, being of such a character, was particularly liable to foreign additions. Its truth as a narrative being admitted, it was removed beyond the sphere within which any one could pretend to judge of probability and reasons. It was likely to attract other marvels to it. In one instance, perhaps in two, this appears to have been the case. What were mere inferences from supposed facts, being at first probably recognized as such, came, in the course of oral narration, to be repeated as themselves facts.

In the commencement of the parable, our Lord described himself as “led by the Spirit into the Desert,” and as fasting there. This representation, I conceive, is to be regarded as a part of the parable. To be “led by the Spirit,” is to be under the influence of thoughts and feelings inspired by God,—to be “full of the Holy Spirit,” as Luke expresses it; and it was the purpose of our Lord to make known, that, under such influences, he looked with abhorrence on the conceptions which the Jews had formed of their coming Messiah. He represented himself as in solitude, fasting; expressing by this the associated ideas of prayer, humiliation, self-distrust, reliance on the strength of God alone,—a state of mind produced by the contemplation of the trials and duties and horrible sufferings attendant on his ministry,—a very different state of mind from that which the Jews would ascribe to their conquering son

of David in looking forward to his reign over all the kingdoms of the world and his possession of all their glory.

But the parable being mistaken for a narrative, the mention of fasting led to that foreign addition to it which I have particularly referred to. It is said, "After fasting forty days and nights, at last he was hungry." We cannot look upon this as a correct report of words uttered by our Lord. He would not introduce into a parable so extravagant a conception without any imaginable purpose. Such a fast would imply a great miracle, — the continuance of the life of Jesus for so long a time without food, — but at the same time a wholly useless miracle. It could not serve as discipline for himself, since we are given to understand that he did not suffer from hunger till after its termination; nor as a proof of his mission from God, for which his other miracles were intended, since no one was present to witness it; nor could it have been designed to instruct his followers through his example, for it was an example which they could not follow except through miraculous aid. And, moreover, our Lord nowhere expressly inculcates fasting on his followers; but, on the contrary, the tendency of his teaching and example was to discourage the common practice of it as a religious observance. But when this parable was mistaken for a narrative of facts, it was conjectured that Jesus would not have mentioned his fast had there not been something extraordinary in its character. Was it not reasonable to suppose that the fast of our Lord before entering on his ministry was like that of Moses before receiving the Law on Mount Sinai, of forty days' continuance? * and like that of Elijah, the restorer of the Law, who fasted for a like time,

* Exodus xxxiv. 28; Deuteronomy ix. 9-18.

before the word of Jehovah came to him in his solitude commissioning him as his servant? * What appeared so probable was, I conceive, readily received as a fact, and, in the course of oral transmission, had become incorporated with the supposed narrative before it was committed to writing by the Evangelists.

But this addition to our Lord's account suggested another, which seemed requisite to complete it. The supposed narrative relates, that at the end of a forty days' fast he was suffering for want of food, and refused to supply himself with it by an exertion of his miraculous powers; the implication apparently being, that it was to be obtained only by a miracle. But, in any case, it was a natural inquiry how his wants were provided for, and his own words in the parable suggested the answer. It was concluded that they were provided for by the providence of God, and it was a common conception of the Jews that the providence of God was administered by angels. Angels, therefore, were represented as the ministers by whom his food was supplied.

WITH regard to the view we have taken of the passage, it may be observed that, if the occasion on which our Lord's words were spoken were such as we have supposed, the explanation which has been given is not only obvious, but is the only one which they will reasonably admit. But the occasion on which they were delivered was neglected and forgotten, as is made evident by no account having been preserved and transmitted to us. Some occasion, however, there must have been for words so extraordinary; and that which I have suggested, namely, the expression of a desire that he would

* 1 Kings xix. 8.

manifest himself as the Messiah expected by the Jews, which often occurred during his ministry, was particularly likely to occur near its commencement, after the declarations of John concerning him. The supposition of this occasion renders clear the meaning of what without it appears unintelligible and purposeless. Its true character is restored to it as a striking parable of very important significance, teaching truths most requisite to be inculcated on his followers.

The Evangelists, I conceive, received and severally recorded the words of Christ as they were transmitted to them by those to whom they were spoken. Luke, who was not an immediate follower of our Lord, was not present at the delivery of the parable. Nor was Matthew, since, if it had been uttered after his call to be an Apostle, he would have recorded it in its proper place in the order of time, among our Lord's discourses. Nor can we reasonably believe that any Apostle was present from whom the Evangelists might derive knowledge of the circumstances attending its delivery, since, otherwise, it seems probable that an account of those circumstances would have been preserved. The words as reported appeared as a narrative, of the purport of which I cannot believe that Matthew or Luke formed any clear conception, but which they thought it their duty to record. Mark, I conjecture, felt the difficulties attending it more strongly, and hence, contrary to his usual custom in writing, merely related what he did not understand in as few words as possible, and without giving any circumstances of the supposed "trial" or "temptation." He has, consequently, left an account of it which, if it stood alone, would be wholly inexplicable to a modern reader, and only to be recognized and passed over as a difficulty by one satisfied from other considerations of the credibility of the Evangelists.

It is not necessary, however, to suppose that the Evangelists and the Apostles understood this account in the gross literal sense in which it has been received by most commentators, from Chrysostom in the fourth century down to our own day. As Jews, they had conceived of Satan as a spiritual being, tempting men by evil suggestions to their minds, not by appearing in a bodily shape and addressing them orally; and their mode of apprehending the account before us would be conformed to this notion of his agency. As regards the form of a dialogue, under which the suggestions of Satan and the considerations by which they were repelled are represented, it would occasion little obscurity; for it was a fashion among the Orientals to give a dramatic form to narratives, words being represented as spoken which it was not intended that the reader should understand as literally spoken, but only as expressive of the purposes or thoughts of the supposed or imagined speaker. The two descriptions that are given of Satan's carrying their Master to some eminence of the temple where he must have been exposed to the gaze of multitudes, and to the top of a high mountain where he might see all the kingdoms of the world, — the one so highly improbable and the other so obviously impossible, that, whatever attempts have been made in subsequent times to explain them into something like credibility, it is not to be supposed that the Evangelists received or recorded them as facts, — they, I conceive, understood as signifying that Satan suggested to the mind of our Lord the thought of being in such situations, that he carried him thither in imagination, and brought to his view the temptations which might there be presented. Regarding their Master only as the anointed of God, considering him as liable at least to temptation, they did not fall into the monstrous conception which seems necessarily to

follow from the opinions held by Christians through many ages of error and superstition, according to which the being to whom Satan made an offer of all the kingdoms of the world, upon condition of his falling down before him and worshipping him, was God himself. Receiving the account as a narrative, they did not receive it as involving the absurdities with which it was encumbered in later times.

NOR is there any difficulty in believing that the Evangelists misunderstood the words of our Lord which we are considering, so far as to regard them as a proper narrative. They fell into other errors equally great. In relating the cases of the diseased persons who were called dæmoniacs, they show that they received the notion common among their countrymen, and existing in the world long before and long after their time, that these diseased persons were actually possessed by dæmons; an error allied to that of supposing the suggestion of evil thoughts and desires to proceed from Satan. The parable of our Lord presented a view of the character of his ministry opposed to all the expectations which the Jews had entertained respecting the Messiah, and to all the ambitious and worldly hopes of his followers. It taught truths of fundamental importance, which he inculcated during his ministry, but which during his ministry his followers would not receive or understand. Imbued with the common notions of their countrymen, they could not give up the hope of such a Messiah as the Jews had expected, or reconcile themselves to the belief that their Master's character and office were so wholly unlike their anticipations. Their traditional errors resisted during his lifetime his plainest teaching, and the unvarying, decisive evidence of facts. When he was travelling for the last time in Galilee, he predicted to

them his approaching violent death by the hands of his enemies, and they were greatly affected. But he connected it with a prediction of his resurrection, and their worldly hopes revived. Almost immediately afterwards he had occasion to address to them a discourse, in which his object was, by the most striking exhortations and the most solèmn warnings, to compose the differences among them, arising from their rivalry with one another as to “who was to be greatest in the kingdom of Heaven,” — the earthly kingdom of their imagined Messiah. A little before his death, on his way to Jerusalem, he repeated the same predictions, with the addition, that he was to be mocked and scourged and crucified. Could they believe this of the Son of David, who was to be a far more illustrious monarch than his ancestor? Of the Son of God, whose miracles they had witnessed, to whom all power was given in heaven and on earth? Of the future deliverer of their nation, — him who was to subdue the Gentiles, their enemies, and to reign triumphantly over the world? Was he to be delivered up by their own people into the hands of the Gentiles, and to be mocked and scourged and crucified? The incongruity must have appeared to their minds so monstrous, that there is no difficulty in believing what Luke relates : “They understood this not at all ; the meaning of his words was hidden from them, and they did not comprehend what he said.”* How little they comprehended appears, indeed, from the very next incident related by Matthew and Mark, that James and John with their mother came to him to solicit the highest places in the kingdom of Heaven, a seat for one on his right hand and the other on his left.†

It was through the prostration of such hopes, that, when he

* Luke xviii. 34.

† Matthew xx. 20 – 28 ; Mark x. 35 – 45.

was apprehended, and the event of his death became certain, all his disciples left him and fled; and that Peter renounced him as his Master, and even denied that he had ever been his follower. These hopes, however, revived after his resurrection, and, only just before his leaving the earth, his disciples asked, “Lord, wilt thou now restore the kingdom to Israel?” *

As, then, the followers of our Lord failed, during his ministry, to apprehend the plainest words respecting the duties and sufferings which so strongly distinguished his office from that which had been assigned to the Jewish Messiah, it is not strange that they should also have failed to understand the meaning and purpose of a parable relating to the same subject, the history of the occasion of which — the key to its meaning — had been lost. Nor is it strange, after the mistake had been once made, and generally received, of considering it as a narrative, that the error should have been perpetuated by the first three Evangelists.

5. “Then the Devil took him to the Holy City, and placed him on a part of the temple.”

“The Holy City”: a name which shows the writer to have been a Jew.

“— a part of the temple.” It is impossible to determine with any confidence what part of the buildings of the temple was intended by the term used in the original, τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ.

12, 13. “But Jesus, hearing that John was

* Acts i. 6.

apprehended, removed to Galilee, and, leaving Nazareth, went to dwell at Capernaum on the shore of the lake."

Respecting John's imprisonment, see Matthew xiv. 3 – 5 ; Mark vi. 17 – 20 ; Luke iii. 19, 20.

"—removed to Galilee": see John iv. 3, 43, and Appendix, Note B, p. 490.

"—went to dwell at Capernaum." Capernaum was the place of our Lord's residence, when not engaged in travelling, during a great part of his ministry ; that is, as I suppose, from a little after the first Passover in his ministry till the approach of the Feast of Tabernacles which preceded the third and last Passover.

Capernaum was on the western side of the lake of Galilee, as appears from the Gospels and from Josephus. It may, likewise, be probably inferred from the Gospels, — namely, from a comparison of Matthew xiv. 34 and Mark vi. 53 with John vi. 17, 24, 25, 59, — that it was situated in the plain of Gennesaret, which extends about three miles along the shore. That such was the fact seems to be determined by a passage of Josephus, which, at the same time, may serve to fix its site more particularly. He says (De Bell. Jud. Lib. III. c. 10. § 8), speaking of the fertility and beauty of the plain of Gennesaret, that, "in addition to its happy temperature, it is watered by a most abundant fountain, which the inhabitants call Capharnaum." This is but another mode of spelling the name Capernaum, and there seems no reason to doubt that the fountain of Capharnaum derived its name from its vicinity to the town of Capernaum or Capharnaum. Such a fountain there is at the distance

of about a mile from the southern extremity of the plain, “rising immediately at the foot of the western line of hills.” It fills a “reservoir nearly a hundred feet in diameter” to the depth of “perhaps two feet,” and “flows out in a large stream, to water the plain below.” This we may reasonably suppose to be the fountain mentioned by Josephus. There is, indeed, another at the northern extremity of the plain, which “gushes out from beneath the rocks, and forms a brook, flowing into the lake a few rods distant.” But it is very improbable that Josephus would have spoken in the terms which he uses of this latter fountain, the fertilizing effects of which are so confined; and as he mentions only a single fountain, there would seem no doubt that he refers to the far more important one first described.

The passages quoted are from Professor Robinson’s *Biblical Researches* (III. 283 – 287). He is disposed to fix the site of Capernaum near the fountain last mentioned, but for reasons which do not seem to me of weight when opposed to the consideration suggested above.

Capernaum was but a small place. Its very ruins have long since perished; and where it once stood, its name is unknown. It possessed but a single synagogue, and that had been built by one who was a Gentile by birth. This appears from Luke vii. 5.

14. “—that what was spoken by Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled.”

“The words *ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν*, rendered in the Common Version, ‘that it might be fulfilled which was spoken,’ and other forms equivalent in sense, in which the verb *πληροῦν*, rendered *to fulfil*, is used, occur frequently in the Gospels, as introduc-

tory to quotations from the Old Testament. There has been much controversy respecting their meaning; and it is a question which it is important to settle. It is clear that they are often used to introduce what the writer considered as a prophecy; but their use, as may be made evident, is not confined to this purpose.

“The verb in question denotes, in its primary senses, *to fill up, to complete, to make perfect*. In a secondary sense, it is applied to a prophecy which is supposed to be accomplished. The event is considered as the counterpart of the prophecy; and by its occurrence, the prophecy, which before was regarded as imperfect, existing without its *completion*, is conceived of as *completed*. But, in a similar manner, it may be applied to a law, which is fulfilled by its performance or execution; — to a maxim when an exemplification of it is pointed out; — to a striking saying originally used on some particular occasion, when another occasion occurs to which it is equally suitable; — and to a declaration or proposition, viewed in reference to the facts by which its truth is shown. Accordingly, the common rendering by the term *fulfil* fails in some cases to give the proper sense. A verbal rendering from an ancient into a modern language must often misrepresent the meaning of the original. The terms *corresponding to, conformably to*, or others equivalent, may sometimes be used with propriety in rendering the formulas under consideration, as, for instance, in St. James ii. 22, 23, where he is speaking of Abraham: ‘You see how his faith operated together with his works, and by his works was his faith perfected; conformably to the Scripture, which says, *Abraham had faith in God, and it was esteemed righteousness in him*, and he was called the friend of God.’ The words quoted are not a prophecy, but a declaration, the statement of an his-

torical fact. This passage, therefore, is alone sufficient to show that the phrase used in the original, ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή, *the Scripture was fulfilled*, may be employed when the writer has no thought of the accomplishment of a prophecy. Thus too, in his last discourse, our Saviour, in referring to Judas (John xiii. 18), quotes the words of Psalm xli. 9: ‘I am not speaking of you all. I know those whom I have chosen; nay, answering to what is said in Scripture, [*or, as is said in Scripture,*] *He who eats bread with me has lifted his heel against me.*’ Here our Saviour applies to his own situation a striking passage uttered by David respecting himself.*” — *On the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Christian Examiner, Vol. V. pp. 54, 55.

See also the note on John xvii. 12.

15. “Galilee of the Gentiles.”

Galilee, or, according to Eusebius, only the northern part of Galilee, was called “Galilee of the Gentiles,” probably on account of the intermixture of Gentiles among the inhabitants, and the influence of their manners. [Compare 1 Maccabees v. 15, 21.]

“* Surenhusius, in his Βίβλος Καταλλαγῆς, gives examples of two forms of quotation from the Rabbinical books, both of which appear to be equivalent to those which are observed upon above. See pp. 2–5 and p. 197. The remarks made above are confirmed by the examples adduced by Surenhusius, and are partly founded upon them. His judgment is of no value, but the examples of Rabbinical quotation which his learning has enabled him to collect may be of use”

17. “Reform; for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand.”

“What was intended by the words ‘kingdom of Heaven’ as used by Christ? and how were they understood by the Jews, his contemporaries, when first uttered? Both questions are important. The Jews had expected that their Messiah would come to establish a temporal kingdom; and the idea of a temporal kingdom was suggested to their minds by those words when they first heard them. But such a kingdom was not intended by our Saviour. Under common circumstances, we endeavor to use words in that sense in which they will at once be understood by our hearers. But we learn from an examination of the Gospels, that Christ employed terms familiar to his hearers in new senses, and left his meaning to be gradually ascertained and settled, as the minds of his disciples might open to the truth. What then was his meaning? This is a question to which I think many readers may find it more difficult to return a clear and precise answer than it appears to be at first thought. He who will look into the commentators may perceive how indefinitely and inaccurately it is liable to be understood. For myself, I conceive him to have intended by ‘the kingdom of Heaven,’ or, in other words, ‘the kingdom of God,’ that state of things in which men should recognize the authority of God as the supreme lawgiver, and submit themselves to his laws, as human subjects to those of a human government. This I suppose to be the radical idea of the term as used by him, an idea which is to be regarded under various relations, is united with different accessory thoughts, and suggests different associations, according to the various connections in which it is presented.” — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 125, 126.

See also the note on Matthew xiii. 11.

18-22. (The call of Peter and Andrew, and of James and John.)

See John i. 35-42.

Our Saviour seems to have selected brothers to be his followers, that there might be harmony among them. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

“Christus vocat duos fratres, et mox aliud par fratrum, Simonis socios (Luc. v. 10), tollendæ scilicet ambitionis et contentionis causâ, utque inter ipsos tanto major animorum consensus atque concordia esset.

“Neque tamen existimandum est, illos temere et sine iudicio, vel repentino quodam impetu animi incitados hoc fecisse: Andreas, cum discipulus Joannis antea fuisset (Jo. i. 41), a magistro suo præparatus et ad Jesum deductus est; multa de Jesu famâ perceperant, Christum ipsum viderant atque audiverant, et miraculosâ piscatione, quæ vocationem istam proxime præcesserat, ita confirmati erant, ut sine ullâ dubitatione crederent Jesum esse doctorem a Deo missum, et Messiam. (Luc. v. 1-11.)” — Wetstein.

24. “And all the sick were brought to him, dæmoniacs, lunatics, and paralytics; and he cured them.”

The words *δαίμων* and *δαιμόνιον* were used by the Greeks to denote any being of superhuman power, whether regarded as a divinity, or as a spirit of an inferior order.* They were applied both to good and evil spirits. The Jews, on the

* Farmer is incorrect in supposing that *δαίμονες* and *δαιμόνια* always mean spirits of the departed.

contrary, as well as the Christian Fathers, always denoted by these terms *evil* spirits, of whom Satan, ὁ διάβολος, was supposed to be the chief. To distinguish between δαίμων or δαιμόνιον and διάβολος, if we translate the latter *Devil*, the former should be rendered *dæmon*.*

The Jews considered diseases and the sufferings of this life in general as punishments of sin. Believing that by sin a man exposed himself to the power of evil spirits, they regarded some disorders as *inflicted* by such spirits, and ascribed others, as insanity and epilepsy, to actual *possession* by them.

This notion of dæmoniacal possession was, however, by no means peculiar to the Jews. It was common among other nations. Nor did it belong especially to the time of our Saviour, but was of long standing even then.† It was received afterwards by the Christian Fathers. There were exorcists in many of the early churches. The same opinion has been held by the Roman Catholic Church, as well as by many Protestants, down to the present time. It still prevails in the East. The cases of the dæmoniacs, then, which are mentioned in the New Testament, are not to be separated from those of other times, either previous or subsequent, since there appears to be no ground for regarding them as different in their nature.

Why, then, do we not receive this opinion as true? There is nothing in the idea of dæmons being allowed to affect the

* The use of διάβολος in the sense of *devil* is peculiar to Jewish and Christian writers. The word never occurs with this meaning in the plural. See the note on John vi. 70.

† See Josephus, Antiq. Lib. VI. c. 8. § 2; c. 11. § 3; Lib. VIII. c. 2. § 5; and De Bell. Jud. Lib. VII. c. 6. § 3. See also 1 Samuel xvi. 14 – 23.

minds and bodies of men irreconcilable with anything we see in the moral government of God. There is no proof *a priori* against such agency.

But the idea of dæmoniacal possession is either a mere assumption, or it was communicated by express revelation. The latter there is no reason to suppose; and we have satisfactory evidence that the diseases which have been attributed to possession by dæmons are owing to natural causes. The common belief in dæmoniacal agency is no proof of such agency; it is a mere mode of accounting for diseases without evidence, without any philosophical ground whatever. The notion had its origin in the superstition and ignorance of early times. The insane themselves, in their more lucid intervals, are often conscious of their own insanity; they feel an influence operating upon them which they cannot resist; they feel that they have no power over their own minds. Superstition would, therefore, readily lead them and others to believe that they were under the control of some superior being, namely, an evil spirit or dæmon. The sudden falls and violent convulsions attending such a disorder as epilepsy would also be naturally referred to the same agency.

The first three Evangelists, in speaking of persons thus affected, use language in accordance with the belief of dæmoniacal possession, a belief which they doubtless held in common with their countrymen. Their error in this particular was not connected with the essential truths of religion, and was, therefore, suffered to remain. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

“That, in order to accomplish the great purpose of his mission, it was necessary for Jesus to refrain from directly opposing many gross errors of his countrymen, is a fact to be constantly kept in view in considering his history.” See

on this subject, Appendix, Note E, pp. 547 – 561, and particularly, in relation to the topic of dæmoniacal possession, p. 553

“Another fact is to be attended to. This is, that our Saviour, on some subjects, and on some occasions, adopted the common language of the Jews, founded on their erroneous conceptions, certainly without any design of sanctioning those conceptions.” See Appendix, Note D, pp. 512 – 518.

On the subject of the dæmoniacs, generally, one may consult Farmer’s Essay, and Wetstein’s note on this verse. The latter is translated in the Christian Disciple, New Series, Vol. V pp. 35 – 42.

[See also Winer’s *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, art. *Besessene*; Jahn’s *Biblical Archæology*, §§ 192 – 197; The Scriptural Interpreter for June, 1832, Vol. II. pp. 255 – 302; and Kitto’s *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, art. *Demoniacs*.]

Ch. V. – VII. (The Sermon on the Mount.)

“The Apostles, familiar as they were with the words of their Master, and continually using them in their discourses, would often quote them disjoined from their original connection. They would blend together those uttered at different times in relation to the same subject; and they would, likewise, naturally apply to new occasions his striking expressions and figurative language, so as sometimes to divert his words, more or less, from their primitive meaning, or, at least, from their primary reference. But these characteristics of their preaching would be likely to produce an effect on works bearing such a relation to it as we suppose the three Gospels to have done.

“This effect is less obvious in the Gospel of Matthew than in that of Luke. But in Matthew’s Gospel we find, I believe, what may be called a systematic, though quite natural arrange-

ment, connected with his general regard to chronological order. When some striking occasion presented itself, he seems, in a few instances, to have brought together sayings of our Lord which he viewed as related to each other, but which were uttered at different times.

“Thus, in the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew appears to have intended to give a general view of our Lord’s teaching, and, taking for his basis what was spoken on that occasion, to have connected with it other precepts and declarations, which, if I may so speak, had been attracted to and associated with that discourse, through their bearing on its main purpose or on particular subjects introduced into it. In consequence, some of our Lord’s words as there given belong, as may seem, to a later period of his ministry; some appear to have been called forth by particular occasions, which afterwards occurred; and precepts which were accommodated to, and limited by, the peculiar and temporary circumstances of those who had devoted themselves to him as his disciples, and which, perhaps, were not addressed to them till their number was increased, and their conceptions of their new duties were more enlarged, are blended with precepts of universal obligation.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxcii, seq.

[THE following references indicate the passages in the other Gospels which correspond to or resemble parts of the Sermon on the Mount as given by Matthew.

Matthew v. 2 – 6.	See Luke vi. 20, 21.
“ 11, 12.	“ Luke vi. 22, 23.
“ 13.	“ Mark ix. 50; Luke xiv. 34, 35.
“ 15.	“ Mark iv. 21; Luke viii. 16; xi. 33.
“ 18.	“ Luke xvi. 17.

Matthew v. 25, 26.	See Luke xii. 58, 59.
“ 29, 30.	“ (Matthew xviii. 8, 9 ; Mark ix. 43 – 48.)
“ 32.	“ Luke xvi. 18. (Matt. xix. 9 ; Mark x. 11, 12.)
“ 39 – 48.	“ Luke vi. 27 – 36.
“ vi. 9 – 13.	“ Luke xi. 2 – 4.
“ 14, 15.	“ Mark xi. 25, 26.
“ 19 – 21.	“ Luke xii. 33, 34.
“ 22, 23.	“ Luke xi. 34 – 36.
“ 24.	“ Luke xvi. 13.
“ 25 – 33.	“ Luke xii. 22 – 31.
“ vii. 1, 2.	“ Luke vi. 37, 38. (Mark iv. 24.)
“ 3 – 5.	“ Luke vi. 41, 42.
“ 7 – 11.	“ Luke xi. 9 – 13.
“ 12.	“ Luke vi. 31.
“ 13, 14.	“ Luke xiii. 24.
“ 16 – 18.	“ Luke vi. 43, 44. (Matthew xii. 53.)
“ 21, 24 – 27.	“ Luke vi. 46 – 49.]

V. 1. “And seeing the multitudes, he went up the mountain; and when he had sat down, his disciples came to him.”

Robinson (Biblical Researches, III. 211) says: “Tabor bears among the Arabs, like so many other mountains, only the general name Jebel et-’Tûr.” See also Vol. I. pp. 140, 177, 405 ; Vol. III. p. 97.

This mode of speaking of “*the* mountain,” without the use of a proper name, or distinctly bringing into view those circumstances by which *the* mountain was individualized in the mind of the speaker, was probably as common in ancient as in modern times.

“And when he had sat down.” It was customary among the Jews for a teacher to sit.

3. “Blessed are they who feel their spiritual wants, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.”

Or, verbally, according to the Common Version, “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.” — “That is, they will enjoy the blessings which God confers upon the subjects of his kingdom, upon those who obey his laws. But are they blessed for what they are, or for the peculiar advantages which they enjoy for becoming what they ought to be? Is the blessing absolute and universal? Or does it refer only to the favorable circumstances of the class spoken of? Or is it confined to some particular individuals of that class? That these are not idle questions may appear from the words which St. Luke ascribes to Christ, ‘Blessed are you poor,’ the qualification ‘in spirit’ being omitted; ‘for yours is the kingdom of Heaven’; * which we cannot understand as referring without exception to the whole class of the poor. The words given by St. Matthew have been by some critics so constructed as to correspond to those of St. Luke.† Thus Wetstein understands them as addressed particularly to Christ’s poor disciples, and as meaning, Blessed in the view of the Spirit, Blessed in the sight of God, are the poor, that is, you poor. It would detain us too long to enter into the reasons for which, as it seems to me, this interpretation is to be rejected. Let us attend, then, to some other expositions. Many commentators of the Romish Church understand by the ‘poor in spirit’ those who voluntarily submit to poverty. Among Protestants, Whitby and others understand, ‘men of a truly humble and lowly spirit.’ Paley, apparently led astray by the sound of the words in the Common

* Luke vi. 20.

† By connecting τῷ πνεύματι with μακάριοι

Version, supposes our Saviour to declare that ‘the poor-spirited are blessed’; and has, in consequence, misrepresented the character of Christian, that is, of true, morality.* We may, with some reason, suppose Christ to have meant, that, in the existing circumstances of the Jews, the poor were far more likely than the rich to have the dispositions which would lead them to become his followers; and that in consequence he pronounced those blessed who had the spirit of the poor. But I think it most probable that his meaning was still different. The word used in the original is to be distinguished from that which denotes simply the want of wealth. It implies destitution, and was used to denote such as lived by charity.† Looking around him upon the multitude, he saw perhaps many who had no earthly goods; and there stood near him the few disciples who had at that time left all to follow him. Borrowing, as was usual with him, a figure from present objects, he speaks of that poverty which is not in external circumstances, but the poverty of the mind, the destitution felt within. The meaning of his words, I believe, was, Blessed are such as feel that they are destitute of all things; and he referred to such as, free from the high pretensions and spiritual pride of the generality of the Jews, might feel that as Jews they had no claims upon God, might recognize their own deficiencies in goodness, and be sensible how much was wanting to their true happiness.” — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 126 – 128.

On this and the other *Beatitudes*, see *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, Appendix.

* See his *Evidences of Christianity*, Part II. ch. ii.

† πτωχοί. “ ‘Beati mendici,’ sic enim exigit interpretatio vocabuli quod in Græco est.” Tertullian. advers. Marcion. Lib. IV c. 14.

4. "Blessed are the mourners, for they will be comforted."

"Does this intend those who deny themselves the blessings of life, and endure voluntary penance, as some Catholics explain the passage? Does it mean those who mourn for their sins, as many Protestant commentators tell us? I think otherwise. The purpose of our Saviour was, I believe, simply to announce that his religion brought blessed consolation to all who mourned." — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 128.

5. "Blessed are the mild, for they will inherit the land."

The language in this verse is taken from Psalm xxxvii. 11. See also Isaiah lx. 21.

"The Jews believed that, if they obeyed God, they should remain in possession of 'the promised land'; if they disobeyed him, that they would be removed from it, and scattered among other nations.* Hence, 'the inheriting of the land' was, in their minds, but another name for the enjoying of God's favor. In this associated and figurative sense the terms were used by Christ. His meaning was literally, Blessed are the mild, for they will enjoy the favor of God." — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 129.

The Jews had expected that their Messiah, by overcoming the Roman power, would deliver them from subjection to it, and establish them in independent and secure possession of 'heir land. Christ, on the other hand, teaches, that the bless-

* See Leviticus, ch. xxvi.; Deuteronomy xxviii. 8, 25, 37, 41, 63, 64; xxix. 28.

ings conferred through him were to be enjoyed by the mild, not by conquerors.

9. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be sons of God."

"Sons of God." See the note on ch. iii. 17.

17, 18. "Think not that I have come to annul the Law or the Prophets. I have not come to annul, but to perfect. I tell you in truth, Not till heaven and earth pass away, shall the smallest letter or stroke pass away from the Law; no, not till all things are ended."

"It was, I conceive, in contemplation of the demoralizing effects commonly attending sudden changes of religious opinion, however beneficial in their final or immediate result, that our Saviour, at the commencement of his ministry, thus addressed his hearers. His meaning was, — Think not that I have come to set aside those religious and moral principles, the true Law of God, which your faith inculcates. I have come to explain them more fully, and to enforce them more solemnly. They remain for ever unchangeable. And thus he goes on to say: 'Whoever, then, shall break one of the least of these commandments [that is, one of the least of those which he was about to give] will be least in the kingdom of Heaven. For I tell you, Unless your righteousness exceed that of the teachers of the Law and the Pharisees, you will not enter the kingdom of Heaven.' " — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, II. 152, 153.

" — till all things are ended " ; — verbally, " till all things

have come to pass." The authority of God's law will remain while the heaven and earth continue ; it will remain till the whole series of events and beings in the universe is accomplished and ended ; — that is, it will never cease.

With verse 18 compare Luke xvi. 17, and on the meaning of the term "the Law," see the note on Luke xvi. 14 – 18.

20. "Unless your righteousness exceed that of the teachers of the Law and the Pharisees."

The teachers of the Law (or, as the original is improperly rendered in the Common Version, *Scribes*) were teachers of the civil as well as of the religious law of the Jews. It was through them that the traditional law was handed down from one generation to another. By these traditions they often perverted or explained away the written law. See ch. xv. 1 – 9. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

By "the righteousness of the teachers of the Law and the Pharisees" is meant the righteousness which they taught and professed to practise.

21. "You have heard that it was said to them of old, *Thou shalt not commit murder.*"

"— to them of old," not "*by* them." See Campbell's note. The invariable use of language in the New Testament requires this rendering.

22. "But I say to you, Whoever is angry with his brother without cause, shall be punishable by the Judges ; and whoever shall call his brother a fool, shall be punishable by the Sanhedrim ; and

whoever shall call him a reprobate, shall be punishable by the fire of hell."

The meaning of Christ's words is this: But I now teach you, that he who, through his own evil passions, is angry with his brother without cause, is equally guilty with him who commits a crime punishable by the law; he who, under the same influence, treats his brother contumeliously, may be compared with one guilty of any of those higher offences of which the Sanhedrim takes cognizance; and he who shows such malice as to call him a reprobate, exposes himself to the severest punishment.

23 - 26. "Therefore, if you bring your gift to the altar," &c.

"This is the conclusion of a passage in which our Saviour warns his followers, in the most solemn manner, against being angry without cause, and expressing ill-will to others even by injurious language. It was common among the Jews to represent a sin or an injury under the figure of a debt,* and the whole passage, therefore, is closely connected. He who has injured his brother is directed not even to worship God, till he has effected a reconciliation. He is to show his good-will toward him quickly, lest he should be called to suffer the full punishment of his offence.

"In Luke, the last part of the passage under consideration appears in quite another connection, and with a different meaning." — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxcvii.

See the note on Luke xii. 54 - 59.

* See Schoettgen on Matthew xviii. 23. See also Matthew vi. 12

25. “Show your good-will to him who has this charge against you, quickly, while you are with him in the way.”

The word *ἀντίδικος*, translated “adversary” in the Common Version, properly means adversary in a suit at law, and the person here intended by the term is the same as “your brother who has a charge against you.”

“—while you are with him in the way.” “The conception appears to be of the person who has injured his brother, meeting him in the public way, as he himself, having left the altar, is seeking him. The words, however, may be understood as they are by Luke, — ‘while you are ON the way with him,’ that is, to the judge; the literal meaning being, ‘before you are called to account for your sin against him.’” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxcvi, seq., note.

31, 32. “It has been said, *Let him who would put away his wife give her a writing of divorce-ment,*” &c.

“Christianity is distinguished by the indissoluble sanctity that it attaches to marriage; — strikingly distinguished, when we consider the general licentiousness of principle, as well as practice, among Jews and Heathens, regarding the intercourse of the sexes, which prevailed before the coming of our Saviour. The sacred character with which marriage is invested by our religion is a necessary means of delivering men from the animal selfishness of the appetites, and of educating them as moral and spiritual beings. It transforms the passion of the sexes into a high and generous sentiment, that puts in action and invigorates whatever is noble in our nature. It makes it

the foundation of the most intimate friendship. Though the sanctity of marriage has been but imperfectly regarded by Christians, yet its effects have been, to raise woman from the state to which she was degraded by the vices of the ancient world, and is still degraded wherever the influence of Christianity is unknown, and to establish her in her proper rank. It has placed the weaker and more refined portion of our race on an equality with the stronger and ruder, and thus caused the purifying and civilizing influence of female virtue to be everywhere diffused. By making the union of parents indissoluble, it secures to their children care and love. It has infused a new vitality into the ties of natural affection; and these, in their numberless ramifications and interlacings, become the strongest bonds of civil society. It has created domestic life, the close union of individuals into families, the school in which our virtues are now formed in childhood, and the sphere in which our best charities are exercised in maturer years.

“But the sanctity of marriage was not recognized in the Levitical Law. It presents in this respect a great contrast with the teaching of Christ. It countenanced the widest liberty of divorce on the part of the husband. If a wife ‘had not favor in the eyes of her husband, because he had found something offensive in her,’ he might ‘write her a bill of divorcement, and put it into her hands, and send her out of his house.’* It was in direct opposition to this law (which is, obviously, from the mention of *writing* a bill of divorcement, of an age when writing had become common), that is, it was in direct opposition to the Levitical Law, that our Saviour thus taught:—

“‘It has been said, *Let him who would put away his wife*

* Deuteronomy xxiv. 1.

give her a writing of divorcement. But I say to you, Whoever puts away his wife except for adultery, causes her to commit adultery; and whoever marries a woman who has been separated from her husband, commits adultery.'

"In the time of our Saviour, the majority of the Jews inferred, as they were authorized to do, from the Levitical Law, that a man might divorce his wife for any cause of offence whatever."* — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. pp. clxxvi. — clxxviii.

See, further, the note on ch. xix. 3 — 9.

"THE first mention by Jesus of the Jewish law respecting divorce is found in the Sermon on the Mount. In this discourse the manner is very striking in which precepts or princi-

* Josephus thus states the law (*Antiq. Jud. Lib. IV. c. 8. § 23*): "Whoever desires to be divorced from his wife for any cause whatever, — and many such causes happen among men, — let him in writing give assurance that he will never use her as his wife any more." See Wetstein's note.

[Among the passages quoted by Wetstein and Lightfoot from the Talmud are the following: —

"The school of Hillel says, If the wife cook her husband's food ill, or over-salting or over-roasting it, she is to be put away."

Also, "If by any stroke from the hand of God she become dumb, or foolish."

"Rabbi Akiba said, If any man sees a woman handsomer than his own wife, he may put her away; because it is said in the Law, *If she find not favor in his eyes.*"

Josephus remarks of himself (*Vit. c. 76*): "About this time I divorced my wife, who had borne me three children, not being pleased with her manners." — See also *Ecclesiasticus xxv. 25, 26.*]

ples derived from the Pentateuch are introduced to notice and remarked on by him, for the purpose of extending or contradicting them. His words are: ‘You have heard that it was said to them of old’ — ‘But I say to you.’ This is language which cannot be reconciled with the supposition that Jesus held the common belief of his countrymen, that those precepts and principles proceeded immediately from God. Introduce the expression of such a belief, and it would give a strange character to his words: ‘You have heard that God said to them of old’ — ‘But I say to you.’ Had he intended to sanction the popular belief, and, at the same time, to signify that he was commissioned to enlarge or repeal the laws formerly given by God, we should find some other forms of introduction than those which he has used; as, for example, ‘God spake by Moses to them of old, saying’ — ‘But my Father now says to you.’” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. p. clxxix, seq.

33 – 37. “Again, you have heard that it was said to them of old, *Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform thine oaths to the LORD*. But I say to you, Swear not at all. But let your manner of speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for what is more than these has its source in what is evil.” *

* “— has its source in what is evil,” — ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν. Τοῦ πονηροῦ may be the genitive either of ὁ πονηρός or of τὸ πονηρόν. Τὸ πονηρόν, meaning ‘what is evil,’ occurs, as I conceive, in the present passage, in John xvii. 15, and in Romans xii. 9. — Ὁ πονηρός, with ἄνθρωπος to be understood after it (which substantive is expressed in Matthew xii. 35, 39, and Luke vi. 45), occurs in Matthew v. 39, vi. 13,

The design of Christ here, as in what precedes, is to inculcate upon his disciples a higher morality than that to which they had been accustomed. They were not merely to regard an oath as sacred, but to regard a simple promise or declaration as sacred. To them their word was to be as an oath, and they were therefore to refrain altogether from confirming what they said by such asseverations as were common among the Jews.

We learn from Philo* that oaths were used among his countrymen profanely and on trivial occasions. A distinction was also made between oaths, some forms not being considered binding, as appears from what was afterward said by Christ, Matthew xxiii. 16, 18. The teachers of the Law likewise assumed the power of absolving from their obligation, and in these two ways a wide door was opened for casuistry and perjury. We learn also from Philo, as well as from Matthew xv. 3 – 6, that there were those who bound themselves by oath not to perform their duty, and even to indulge in sin. For these reasons, therefore, — as well as for that before mentioned, — because often profane, leading to perjury, and sometimes intended to bind to sin, our Saviour interdicts altogether such a use of oaths as was then customary.

The forms of swearing which Christ mentions, it appears from the Rabbinical writings, as well as from his mention of

(see the notes on these passages,) 1 Corinthians v. 13, and 2 Thessalonians iii. 3. — ‘Ο πονηρός as a name of the Evil One, commonly called in the New Testament ὁ διάβολος or ὁ Σατανᾶς, is found in Matthew xiii. 19, 38, Ephesians vi. 16, and several times in the First Epistle of John.

* De Decem Oraculis. II. 196. De Specialibus Legibus. II. 270 seqq. — See also Matthew xxvi. 72, 74; Mark xiv. 71; James v. 12.

them, were common among the Jews.* They were such, however, as were used in ordinary intercourse, and not upon solemn and judicial occasions. They were considered as not of that awful and obligatory nature which belonged to an oath in which God was directly appealed to. They appear to have been used with levity, and but little sense of obligation. In opposition to the loose notions concerning them, Christ taught that in these, as in any other oath, and equally in a simple affirmation, God was to be regarded as the witness of what was said.

The limitation of our Saviour's language, so far as any limitation is required, is to be gathered from the evident occasion and purpose of the precept.

36. "Neither shall you swear by your head, for you cannot make one hair white or black."

To swear by one's head is to swear by one's life. In the East, black hair is a sign of youth, white hair of old age. In saying, "You cannot make one hair white or black," Christ appears to have spoken figuratively, his meaning being, You cannot make yourself old or young; you cannot contract or lengthen the life by which you swear.

39. "But I say to you, Resist not evil-doers."

Or, verbally, "Resist not the evil-doer." According to a common use of language, the name of a class is here employed, not to designate a particular individual of that class, but to denote all the individuals who compose it, — the generic name in the singular being thus equivalent in meaning to the same

* See Lightfoot, Wetstein, and Gill, on this passage.

name in the plural. I here use the plural to prevent any ambiguity.

“Resist not evil-doers.” This precept, exemplified and enforced as it is in what follows, is a very remarkable one, and leads to very important considerations. The language of Jesus leaves no doubt as to his meaning. He explicitly and strongly commanded his disciples to submit unresistingly to whatever injuries they might suffer.

But this is a precept, which, if understood as it commonly has been, as one of universal obligation, embarrasses the history of our Lord’s teaching with a most serious and irremovable difficulty. If no resistance is to be made to evil-doers, then all power which they are disposed to exercise must be yielded up to them. The world would consequently become the prey of the injurious and violent. It would be subjected to the ever-changing rule of the strongest among them. If no resistance to injury is to be made by individuals separately, none is to be made by any number of individuals combined together; they are not to call upon one another for aid; no resistance, therefore, is to be made by society.

But, viewed in a proper light, the precept presents a very different aspect. It was not delivered by Jesus as one of general obligation, but was particularly addressed to his immediate disciples in relation to their peculiar circumstances and consequent duties. It was through them that his religion was to be spread. But in becoming his followers they would expose themselves to hatred and persecution. In laboring like him for the good of their fellow-men, they would have to submit as he did to sufferings and outrages. “They will put you out of their synagogues,” he told them; “nay, the hour is coming when he who kills you will think he is offering a sacrifice to God.” Into

this world of enemies the followers of our Lord went forth to teach, to convert, and to reform it. It would have been wholly inconsistent with their great duty to undertake to repel the injuries to which they were constantly exposed. Had they done so, had they attempted to vindicate themselves from wrong, their time must have been occupied, not in making converts by appealing to the understandings and hearts of men, but in a perpetual quarrel with those about them ; and the kingdom of Heaven, if established at all, must have been established by force, as a kingdom of this world, for which the followers of Christ were commissioned to fight. Their circumstances were most peculiar, and great and peculiar virtues were required of them. They were called upon to sacrifice the common right of our nature, the right of self-protection ; and they did so. Who but a teacher from God could have made such a requirement from his followers ? What writer could have imagined it to have been made if the command had not actually been given ?

The circumstances and duties of the first followers of our Lord sufficiently explain the precept we are considering. But there is another consideration too important to be overlooked. Those hearers of our Lord who at this time were disposed to recognize his authority regarded him, with more or less confidence, as being the expected Messiah. But the Messiah, in their view, was to be the great leader in delivering the Jewish nation from the oppression and the injuries of the Romans. In effecting this work, his followers were to form his army. It was (as we have seen) the purpose of our Lord to counteract these false conceptions of his office in the very opening sentences of the discourse which he at this time delivered ; and nothing could tend more effectually to crush them, and the feelings connected with them, than the passage on which we are commenting.

The precepts concerning irrisistance are of the same class as those in which our Lord directed his followers to have no solicitude about their means of living, their clothing, and food ; to have no regard to their worldly concerns ; to leave all and follow him ; to sell all that they had and give it to the poor. These were directions conformed to their peculiar office as the first teachers of his religion, and referring to that special providence by which their wants would be provided for without their own exertions.

In regard simply to the fact, that these precepts of irrisistance refer to a then existing and peculiar state of things, they are analogous to many others in the discourses of Jesus ; — as when he said, “ Whatever the teachers of the Law and the Pharisees may direct you to observe, observe and do.” Matthew xxiii. 2, 3.

42. “ To him who asks of you, give ; from him who would borrow of you, turn not away.”

Luke (vi. 30) has expressed the meaning of this verse more forcibly, and perhaps preserved the language of Jesus more correctly.

Compare Deuteronomy xv. 8, 10, where the verb *δανείζω* is used in the Septuagint.

VI. 2. “ Do not sound a trumpet before you.”

This is said metaphorically ; the meaning is, Do not make proclamation of it.

9 – 13. (The Lord's Prayer.)

This prayer is represented by Luke (xi. 1 – 4) as having been dictated by our Lord in compliance with the request of

one of his disciples. According to this statement, it may be regarded as not given at this time, but as one of those passages which Matthew introduced into the Sermon on the Mount on account of their connection with topics on which our Lord spoke in that discourse. The request, as reported by Luke, implies that the disciples wished their Master to furnish them with a prayer particularly appropriate to their own circumstances. Being Jews, they were not ignorant of the proper subjects and language of prayer in general.

Conformably to this remark, we find that the prayer dictated by our Lord [was especially adapted to the character and circumstances of his immediate followers.]

* * * * *

“Thy kingdom come.” By “the kingdom of Heaven” was meant by Jesus the state of men’s minds which was to be produced by the reception of Christianity. (See the note on ch. iv. 17.) In directing his disciples to pray for the coming of the kingdom of Heaven which he had predicted, he taught them to pray for the reception and establishment of his religion, in promoting which they were to be fellow-workers under him.

“Give us this day our needful food.” All we receive is from God, but as regards the daily supply of our bodily wants, he has commonly made it consequent on our own exertions in procuring it, and however proper is the recognition in our own minds of our ultimate dependence upon God, yet a particular prayer for the supply of their daily wants is evidently one peculiarly adapted to the condition of those about to relinquish all concern for their worldly interests, and to rely on the providence of God for their necessary support.

“Forgive our offences, as we forgive those who offend against us.” In his previous directions concerning irresistance and

the forgiveness of injuries, our Lord had prepared his disciples for the outrages they were to suffer, and to suffer from those for whose good they were to continue to labor. This precept was of fundamental importance, but it is, at all times, a very hard one for men whose characters have not been formed by Christianity. It was particularly hard for Jews, according to the dispositions commonly ascribed to them and commonly belonging to them. It was now incorporated by Jesus into their prayers. The first disciples were, in their acts of devotion, under the sense of the immediate presence of God, to recognize the duty of forgiving the outrages to which they would be continually exposed.

This solemn recollection of the duty of forgiveness was equally appropriate to the early Christians during the first three centuries of persecution. But it is not equally so to the generality of Christians at the present day. They have no such outrages to forgive, no such feelings of injury to repress. He who now comes to address God with proper Christian feeling will not, for the most part, have his attention forcibly directed to the wrongs he may have suffered, though, if from any cause his resentment has been strongly excited, the precept implied in this clause of the prayer is still equally adapted to and binding upon him.

IN the last two clauses of the prayer the meaning is disguised in the Common Version.

* * * * *

“Bring us not into trial, but deliver us from evil”; — or rather, perhaps, “from evil-doers.”

* * * * *

On the use of *ὁ πονηρός* and *τὸ πονηρόν* see the marginal note on ch. v. 33 – 37.

[The remainder of the thirteenth verse in the Received Text and in the Common Version — “For thine is the kingdom,” &c. — is omitted in authorities of such importance as to prove that it is not genuine. Its insertion may be explained as follows: —] “When our Lord’s prayer was used in the liturgies of the ancient Church, this doxology was subjoined; and transcribers, being accustomed to it in this connection, introduced it into their copies.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. xliii.

16 – 18. “And when you fast, do not,” &c.

The precept relates to private fasts.

19. “Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moths and worms consume.”

Βρῶσις, “worm.” See Kuinoel’s note. The worm referred to is one which consumes grain.

22. “The eye is the lamp of the body.”

See the note on Luke xi. 33 – 36.

24. “— or he will attach himself to one, and neglect the other. You cannot be servants of God and of Mammon.”

That is, — or at least, through his attachment to one, he will neglect the other. The disjunctive conjunction is often used when what follows is not antithetical to what precedes it, but presents the same fundamental idea with some modification. Between the two sets of propositions in the alternative before us, no direct opposition can well be supposed. Before the first of them I do not render *ἢ*, “either,” because this more

formal mode of introducing the two parts of an alternative suggests, though it does not necessarily imply, that there is an opposition of meaning between them.

The purport of what our Lord said is this: The love of the world will cause men to hate the service of God, or will lead them to neglect it. This truth was in a peculiar manner applicable to his first disciples, who were called upon to sacrifice all their worldly interests, and devote themselves to the service of God as followers of Christ. By Mammon, as Clement of Alexandria remarks,* is not meant money simply; but the various pleasures which money may afford.

25 - 34. "Be not anxious about the food necessary for life," &c.

The precepts contained in the latter part of this chapter were addressed by our Lord to his immediate disciples, who, when engaged in the promulgation of his religion, were to dismiss all care for their worldly concerns, and to rely on the providence of God for the supply of their daily wants. In a qualified sense, however, they apply to all men. The precept, "Do your duty and trust in God," is a universal one. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

See the note on ch. v. 39.

25. "Is not life a greater gift than food, and the body than its clothing?"

That is, Cannot he who has given life give food, and he who has formed the body provide its clothing?

* Stromat. VII. c. 12. p. 875.

26. "Look at the birds of heaven."

Our Saviour may have referred to birds then flying over the heads of the multitude, and in speaking of the lilies of the field just afterwards (verse 28), may have pointed to the flowers growing near by. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

27. "And who of you, with all his anxiety, can add one cubit to his life?"

"—to his *life*," not "stature." See Campbell's note on Luke xii. 25, and Wakefield's Commentary on Matthew. See also Kuinoel's note.

33. "Be, in the first place, solicitous about the kingdom of God and the righteousness which he requires."

"The righteousness which he requires." Note this use of the term ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ Θεοῦ.

VII. 2. "The measure which you deal to others will be dealt to you."

This was a common saying among the Jews. See Wetstein and Lightfoot.

3. "Why do you look at the straw in your brother's eye, and not consider the beam in your own eye?"

The figures used by Jesus, though so foreign from our modes of expression, would not appear strange to Jews. Corresponding language is found in the Talmud. Thus, in one place,

Rabbi Tarphon is introduced as saying, "I wonder whether there be any one in this age who will receive correction; who, when he is reprov'd and told to cast the straw out of his eye, will not answer, Cast the beam out of your own." This passage is elsewhere repeated in nearly the same words; and in another, it is said, "A beam or mud has got into his eye and blinded him." See Lightfoot and Wetstein.

5. "Hypocrite!"

Or rather, perhaps, here and in some other passages, "False pretender!"

6. "Give not what is holy to dogs, nor cast your pearls before swine." *

The purpose of the precept given by our Lord in this verse could not have been to forbid his disciples to preach the truths of his religion to the impure and unholy, on the ground that such men would despise these truths, and show resentment toward those who taught them. This would have been inculcating a course of conduct altogether different from what he constantly enforced by his example and precepts, and from that which his Apostles pursued. The words seem to have reference to the ostentation of the Jews in boasting of their peculiar religious knowledge and privileges before the heathen who

* "Solebant Judæi gentes per contumeliam appellare canes. Megilla Exod. xii. 16 : Convocatio sancta est vobis : vobis, non canibus ; vobis, non extraneis. Midrasch Tillim IV. 8 : Gentes mundi comparantur canibus S. D. Esai. lvi. 11." — Wetstein on Matthew xv. 26, where he quotes other passages to the same effect. See also Schoettgen on Rev. xxii. 15.

dwelt among them, whom they considered as unclean, as dogs and swine, while they themselves were a holy people. Such claims to religious superiority could only tend to exasperate those by whom they were already disliked and despised, and in whose power they were. The direction is thus connected with what precedes, which has reference to the spirit of the Jews in condemning all not of their own nation. Compare the Epistle to the Romans, ch. ii.

12. “Do, then, to others whatever you would that they should do to you,” &c.

The connection expressed by the word *then* appears to consist in a reference to the goodness of God who gives thus beneficently. Such being his goodness, do you imitate it in showing kindness to your fellow-men. Compare ch. v. 43–48.

“This is the Law and the Prophets.” That is, this is all that religion requires of us in regard to our conduct toward others. — This remark is from *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

On the use of the term “the Law,” or “the Law and the Prophets,” see the note on Luke xvi. 14–18.

14. “How strait is the gate, and narrow the way, leading to life! — and there are few who find it.” *

Our Lord had particularly in view the peculiar obstacles to becoming his follower which existed at the time when he spoke.

* Τι στενή ἡ πύλη, “How strait is the gate!” The reading τί instead of ὅτι has not only a preponderating weight of evidence in its favor, but is confirmed by the intrinsic character of the two readings,

19. "Every tree that bears not good fruit will be cut down and cast into the fire."

This verse is the same with verse 10 of the third chapter, and here seems out of place. There is, however, no reason to suppose it an interpolation.

22, 23. "Though many should say to me at that time, Master, Master," &c.

"At that time":—that is, when the kingdom of Heaven shall be established. "Then" in the following verse has the same reference.

By the supposed "many" saying "Master, Master," is evidently to be understood "many not doing the will of God." The verbal, which is the common rendering, "Many will say to me," presents a great difficulty; since we cannot believe that *many* performed miracles in the name of Christ, who were such transgressors of God's laws as to merit the severest reprobation. We have in this passage, I conceive, an example of an idiom frequent in Matthew's Gospel, and found elsewhere in the New Testament. Two propositions are made, or two questions asked, which are not to be considered as independent propositions or questions. The former of the two merely ex-

which is such that transcribers would not have persistently changed $\delta\tau\iota$, which presents an obvious meaning, for $\tau\acute{\iota}$, the use of which as it here occurs is not familiar.

For this use of $\tau\acute{\iota}$ see the note of Grotius, who says, " $T\acute{i}$ pro $\acute{\omega}s$ Hellenistarum est"; Schleusner, Thes. Vet. Test. V. 304 (add 2 Samuel vi. 20); the Etymologicum Magnum as quoted by Metstein; and compare the use of $\eta\eta$ in Hebrew.

presses some condition real or supposed, which is to be viewed in connection with the latter. They both constitute but one complex proposition or question, of which the former is to be regarded only as a conditional clause. The verb contained in it may sometimes be rendered as a participle, but often better in the conditional mood with some conjunction, as *if*, or *though*.

This idiom occurs also in Matthew viii. 9; ix. 14; xi. 25; xii. 31 (and the parallel passages); xv. 26; xvii. 20; xviii. 21; xxiii. 15; Mark vii. 27; ix. 39; Luke x. 21; xi. 5, 42; xiii. 24; xiv. 5; xv. 24, 32; John iii. 19; iv. 18; v. 34; ix. 19; x. 9; xiv. 9; Rom. vi. 17; Isaiah xii. 1; lxv. 22. [See also the notes of Grotius on Matthew viii. 9 and John vii. 34; Gesenius on Isaiah v. 4; and Winer's Grammatik, (5te Aufl.) § 64. III. 3. p. 630, and § 46. Anm. 2. p. 414.]

A similar idiom is found in classical Greek. See Matthiæ's Greek Grammar, § 622. 4, and Plato's Gorgias, pp. 512, A; 516, E.

28, 29. "The multitudes were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the teachers of the Law."

The teachers of the Law in support of what they said appealed to the words of the Law or to the traditionary expositions of it, — to the opinions of preceding Rabbis, which, for example, are continually quoted in the Talmud.

VIII. 2 - 4. (The cure of the leper.)

Mark (i. 40 - 45) and Luke (v. 12 - 15) represent this miracle as performed by Christ after leaving Capernaum. It is one of the three remarkable instances in which they differ from Matthew, and agree with each other, in their chronological mis-

arrangement of events related by the three Evangelists in common. For an explanation of this discrepance, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. clxxxiii. – clxxxv.

4. “Go, show yourself to the priest, and make the offering which Moses directed, for a proof to the people.”

See Leviticus xiv. 2, 10, 21, 22.

“—to the people,” *αὐτοῖς*. *Αὐτοί* is often thus used indefinitely. See Hebrews xi. 28; Matthew xii. 9, 15; xix. 2; xxi. 17; Luke v. 17; xii. 15.

9. “For even I, who am a man under command, have soldiers under me, and I say to one, Go, and he goes.”

On the idiom in this verse, see the note on ch. vii. 22, 23.

10. “I have not found such faith in Israel.”

Οὐδέ, ne quidem. But the common rendering, “*even* in Israel,” by putting the emphasis in a wrong place, conveys a false idea.

11. “Many will come from the East and the West, and place themselves at table with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of Heaven.”

It is difficult for us to conceive how this declaration must have affected the minds of Jews who considered it as a contamination to eat with Heathens.

With verses 11, 12, compare Luke xiii. 28, 29.

12. “But the sons of the kingdom will be cast forth into the outer darkness.”

The language is founded on the conception of the kingdom of God as a kingdom of light.

14–16. (Account of the cure of Peter’s wife’s mother, and of many others at Capernaum.)

For a comparison of this passage with the parallel passages of Mark (i. 29 – 34) and Luke (iv. 38 – 41), showing that the three Evangelists did not transcribe or translate from any common written document, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. clxi. – clxiii.

17. “So that what was said by Isaiah the prophet was fulfilled: — *He delivered us from our infirmities, and bore away our diseases.*”

See Taylor’s “*Scripture Doctrine of Atonement*,” p. 32. See also Wetstein’s note.

Tertullian, remarking upon the passage of Isaiah as applied to Christ, says: “*Portare autem Græci etiam pro eo solent ponere, quod est tollere.*” — *Advers. Marcion. Lib. IV. c. 8.*

Matthew, in this quotation, follows the Hebrew, and not the Septuagint.

18. “But Jesus, seeing a great multitude about him, gave orders to go over to the other side.”

Mark (iv. 35 – v. 43) and Luke (viii. 22 – 56) represent the voyage across the lake of Galilee, with the miracles accompanying and immediately following it, — excepting the cure of the

paralytic, — as having taken place at a later period of Christ's ministry, after the discourse in which he delivered a number of parables near the shore by Capernaum. For an explanation of this discrepancy, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. clxxxii, seq.

20. “The foxes have holes, and the birds of heaven have roosting-places; but the Son of Man has not where to lay his head.”

This was said to destroy any ambitious expectations in the teacher of the Law.

21. “And another of his disciples said to him, Master, let me first go away and bury my father.”

As the Jews buried the dead with little delay, — probably, when time permitted, on the day of their death, — and as the interval was occupied by preparations for interment, it is not probable that the disciple mentioned had left the dead body of his father, to join the multitude about Jesus. Nor could there be any urgent reason for his accompanying Jesus in this voyage across the lake. We must, therefore, understand the purport of his request to have been, Let me wait till the death of my father before I join myself to you as one of your immediate followers. Perhaps he knew or believed that his father would be adverse to his doing so. Perhaps he was willing to secure the favor of Jesus by an early profession of adherence, from which he might derive advantage in case he should prove to be the Messiah, and was at the same time desirous to escape those sufferings and dangers to which his immediate followers were then exposed. It appears by the account of Luke (ix. 59) that he

made his request after Jesus had invited him to become one of his followers.

28. “There met him two dæmoniacs coming from the tombs.”

Note the use of the definite article, — “*the* tombs.” So in verse 32, “*the* steep,” and in the corresponding passage of Mark and Luke, “*the* mountain,” implying that the place was familiar to the mind of the narrator.

29. “Why dost thou trouble us, Son of God?”

Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί; These words are to be understood, here and elsewhere in the New Testament, as the language of expostulation, not of anger or of disrespect, conformably to their use in the Old Testament. Compare Judges xi. 12; 2 Samuel xvi. 10; xix. 22; 1 Kings xvii. 18; 2 Kings iii. 13; 2 Chronicles xxxv. 21; Joel iii. 4. See the note of Grotius.

The dæmoniacs speak, as insane persons, in the name of the dæmons by which they imagined themselves possessed. — This remark is from *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

30-33. “Now there was at a distance from them a herd of many swine, feeding. . . . And those who were tending them fled, and went to the town, and told everything, and what had happened to the dæmoniacs.”

The reason of our Saviour’s permitting the madness of the dæmoniacs to be transferred to the swine was probably this, — that a deeper impression might be produced upon the minds of

the Gergesenes, in whose country he was, than would have been made by the cure of the dæmoniacs alone.

It appears that there were very few people about him except his immediate followers. If, then, those who had been cured had returned home, and merely on their own authority, unsupported by other testimony, had reported the miracle of their cure by Jesus, their report would hardly have been believed. But to the miracle of the possession and destruction of the swine, not only those who had been cured, but also the keepers of the herd, would bear witness. It was, therefore, performed by our Lord in attestation, as it were, of the former. He was not about to remain and preach in that region, which he seldom visited, and he desired to give a striking manifestation of his power, the knowledge of which would be spread through the country.

As to the destruction of private property occasioned by this miracle, it needs only to be remarked, that God, by whose immediate agency alone a miracle can be wrought, may bestow or take away what he pleases. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

See Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels pp. 281 – 283, and compare the note on Matthew xiv. 13.

IX. 1 – 8. (The cure of the paralytic at Capernaum.)

Mark (ii. 1 – 12) and Luke (v. 17 – 26) mention circumstances omitted by Matthew, particularly the great crowd, and the manner by which the paralytic was conveyed to Jesus. For a comparison of Matthew's account with the parallel passages, illustrating the nature of the verbal correspondence of the first three Gospels, see Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I p. cxii, seqq.

2. “Take courage, son! your sins have been forgiven.”

Our Saviour perceived that the paralytic had such faith as would lead him to renounce his sins, and, in consequence, declared his sins forgiven. — Or, perhaps, his sins had been the cause of his disease.

5. “Which is easier; to say, Your sins have been forgiven; or to say, Rise, and walk?”

“Which is easier?” The meaning is, Which implies the possession of greater power and authority from God? Is it not to be inferred that he may declare a man’s sins to be forgiven, whom God has commissioned to perform such a miracle? Here, then, as elsewhere, Jesus appeals to his miraculous powers as proof of his divine authority.

9 – 17. (The call of Matthew, &c.)

For a comparison of this passage with the parallel accounts of Mark (ii. 14 – 22) and Luke (v. 27 – 39), showing that no one of the three Evangelists copied from either of the others, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. cxxxiii. – cxxxix.

10. “And while Jesus was at table in the house.”

It appears to be from modesty, and therefore to afford an incidental proof that Matthew was really the author of this Gospel, that he does not expressly state that he made an entertainment on this occasion; “a great feast,” as is said by Luke (ch. v. 29).

12, 13. “But Jesus, hearing their question, said to them, The well need not a physician, but the sick. But go ye, and learn what this means, *I desire goodness, and not sacrifices*. For I did not come to give an invitation to righteous men, but to sinners.”

The words of Christ are imperfectly reported by Mark and Luke, the important idea being omitted that the Pharisees were equally sinners with those to whom they gave that name ; and the meaning of the last sentence being somewhat changed in Luke by the addition of the words “to reformation,” which, though they are found in some copies of Matthew, are an interpolation from Luke into this Evangelist.

“Our Saviour’s answer, as given by Matthew, is, I conceive, to be thus understood : You reproach me for being with tax-gatherers and sinners ; it is fitting I should be ; the well need not a physician, but the sick. But do not think that you are less morally diseased than those whom you despise. You no more than they perform what God requires ; while you insist on ceremonies and superstitious observances, you neglect what is essential in religion and morality. Go ye, and learn what this means, *I desire goodness and not sacrifices*. I came to give an invitation to all to accept God’s mercy ; and, as regards you, as well as them, I did not come to give an invitation to righteous men, but to sinners.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxxxvii, note *.

The declaration ascribed to God by the prophet Hosea, and here adopted and sanctioned by our Saviour, “I desire goodness, and not sacrifices,” has a bearing on the question, whether

the ritual Law was of divine origin. See Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. II. p. cxliii.

14. "Then the disciples of John came to him, saying, Why, when we and the Pharisees fast often, do not your disciples fast?"

The Pharisees, and the more religious among the Jews, fasted twice a week, on Mondays and Thursdays.* That they were actually keeping a fast at this time does not appear from the words of Matthew, but is, I think, distinctly expressed by Mark. On the other hand, we may infer from Matthew what we cannot from Mark and Luke, that the day on which this discourse took place was Monday. On Saturday (the Jewish Sabbath) Jesus preached in the synagogue at Capernaum, and cured the diseased who were brought to him after sunset. Afterward he went on board a boat and passed across the lake to Gergesa, a distance probably of about eight or ten miles. That this took place the same evening may be concluded from the apparently unbroken narrative of Matthew, from the fact that Mark (iv. 35), though he has misplaced the account of this voyage, represents it as commenced in the evening, and from the circumstance that Jesus was asleep during the storm which occurred. On Sunday, therefore, the events related in ch. viii. 28 – 34 took place near Gergesa; and remaining, as is related, but a very short time there, on Monday Jesus was again in Capernaum.

This being the case, we perceive at once how surprised and offended the disciples of John and the Pharisees must have been at his partaking of an entertainment among tax-gatherers

* This appears from the Talmud. See also Luke xviii. 12.

and sinners on a day when they conceived that a religious man should fast.

See also Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. p. cxxxvii, note †.

15-17. "Can the companions of the bridegroom mourn while the bridegroom is with them? No one puts a patch of undressed cloth on an old garment. . . . Nor do men put new wine into old skins."

The words of Jesus (as given in verse 15) imply that such fasting as was common among the Jews should proceed from feelings adapted to produce it, and should not be practised as a mere external observance, such feelings not existing. By the "undressed cloth" and "new wine" (in the verses which follow) may be understood the new modes of life which he allowed in his followers, so different from those which had been hitherto expected in men supposed to aim at a highly religious character. By the "old garment" and "old skins" he intends all who were still possessed by their ancient prejudices. It would be incongruous for them, without comprehending the spirituality of the new religion, to adopt the mode of life of his disciples, to neglect fasting and similar observances. Unless they became converts to the new faith, such a course of conduct would imply a disregard of all religious obligation.

The meaning of Jesus may be presented in a different light, by considering that the question of John's disciples was in effect this: Why do you allow your disciples to neglect what our master, John, did not allow us to neglect? The answer of Jesus will then have this bearing: John was not commissioned

to teach a new religion ; there was no reason why he should make any change in the religious customs which his disciples had followed ; nor, considering his limited authority and their ignorance and prejudices, could this have been safely done. It would have been like sewing undressed cloth upon an old garment, or putting new wine in old skins.

See Jones's *Illustrations of the Gospels*, pp. 186, 187.

23. "And when Jesus came to the ruler's house, and saw the flute-players," &c.

The musicians and mourners had been summoned as attendants on the funeral, interment among the Jews taking place very soon after death. Our Saviour, by directing them to withdraw, and by the language which he uses concerning the child, gives them to understand that their attendance would not be required.

25. "After the company had been put out."

The company appears to have been put out by Jesus from various considerations. The confusion of a crowd, in which many would hear or see but imperfectly, might have given occasion to false accounts of the miracle, and even to doubts of a miracle having been performed. A large number of individuals would have been strongly excited ; and it was always an object with our Lord to prevent or repress any immediate excitement from his miracles, as this served only to put in action the false expectations of the Jews respecting their Messiah. The exclusion of the crowd would naturally cool their feelings concerning him. He was also, perhaps, influenced by a regard to the parents of the child, whose strong emotions at

the restoration of their daughter could not have been of a kind to be indulged before comparatively uninterested spectators.

28. “And when he had entered the house,” &c.

This definite mode of expression, “*the* house,” without anything to explain its reference, occurs repeatedly in Matthew (xiii. 1, 36, xvii. 25) and in Mark (ix. 33, x. 10). The particular house in which Jesus resided when at Capernaum must be intended by it. Its use shows that the idea of that house was familiar to the mind of the narrator, and that he did not advert to the fact that he might have readers who would not at once understand to what house he referred.

The expression is not found in Luke. As he wrote for Gentile readers, and was somewhat more skilled in composition than Matthew and Mark, he would be led to avoid the use of a definite term which would not directly convey to such readers a definite idea.

It seems probable, that the house in which Jesus resided was that of Peter. Peter, it appears, had a house at Capernaum, and we may readily suppose that Jesus took up his abode with him. Accordingly, we find that he went to Peter’s house on the day of his first public appearance at Capernaum (viii. 14), but two days, as I conceive, before the events which Matthew is here relating.

“Have you faith that I am able to do this?” Our Saviour frequently asks those for whom his miracles were performed respecting their *faith*, in order to direct their attention to himself, and to give them an intimation of what they ought further to believe of him who showed such power. — This paragraph is from *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

37, 38. "The harvest is abundant, but the laborers are few," &c.

That is, many need instruction, but there are few teachers.
— *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

The figure appears to have been drawn from the harvest then ripening in the fields around. See the narrative, ch. xii. 1, and note the place of that narrative in Mark and Luke.

Ch. X. (Directions to the Apostles.)

Matthew, according to his usual manner, appears to have brought together, in this chapter, directions given by our Lord to his disciples at different times. See Appendix, Note B, p. 493.

2-4. (The names of the Apostles.)

The coincidence is observable between Matthew's arrangement of the Apostles in pairs, and the account of Mark (vi. 7), that Jesus sent them forth in pairs; especially as Mark in giving their names (iii. 16-19) does not correspond in this mode of arrangement with Matthew.

"Bartholomew." This name in the original is what is called a patronymic, denoting only that the person spoken of was "the son of Tolmi" or "Ptolemy." It is not improbable that he was Nathanael, who is spoken of in connection with Philip, John i. 43-51, and who is mentioned in connection with others who were Apostles, John xxi. 2.

"James the son of Alpheus." Alpheus is the same with Clopas, who is mentioned by John (xix. 25) as husband of Mary who was kinswoman of the mother of Jesus, the names

Alpheus and Clopas being only different modes of giving in Greek the same Hebrew name. James, therefore, was one of those who in the Common Version are erroneously called *brethren* of Jesus. The word in the original should have been rendered *kinsmen*. He is called a "kinsman of the Lord" by St. Paul, Galatians i. 19.

"Lebbeus, also called Thaddeus," is by Luke named Judas; and in the Epistle ascribed to Judas, he calls himself the brother of James, a representation which, if the Epistle be not his, was probably founded on a tradition which there is no particular reason to doubt.

"Simon the Zealot" * was perhaps another brother of the same family. This is inferred in the following manner. Mary the wife of Clopas was, as appears from a comparison of John xix. 25 with Matthew xxvii. 56, the mother not only of James, but of Joses. Judas we suppose to be the brother of James. If this be so, Mary was the mother of James, Joses, and Judas, and these were kinsmen of Jesus. But the Nazarenes in enumerating his kinsmen (Matthew xiii. 55) mention James and Joses and Simon and Judas. It appears, then, not unlikely, that the Simon who was his kinsman was, as well as his other kinsmen, James and Judas, one of his disciples. Of the fourth, Joses, we have no further knowledge.

See also the note on ch. xiii. 55.

* Σίμων ὁ κανανίτης, not "Simon the Canaanite," but "the Zealot," κανανίτης (from the Aramæan ܟܢܢܝܬܐ) meaning the same as ζηλωτής, the epithet by which Simon is designated in Luke. The class of persons among the Jews called "Zealots" consisted of individuals who took it upon themselves in their private capacity to punish offences committed against the Jewish laws, which were not punishable under the Roman law. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

5. "Go not away to the Gentiles," &c.

Observe that this direction is not found in the other Evangelists.

9, 10. "Provide neither gold nor silver," &c.

There is a verbal difference in Mark vi. 8, 9. See the note on that passage.

11. "And abide with him till you leave the place."

The Apostles were not to be attentive to their personal accommodation; nor to leave the house in which they had first been received, for another, in quest of better entertainment.

12, 13. "And upon entering a house, salute it," &c.

According to the Jewish custom, the form of salutation was, "Peace be to this house."

14. "Shake off the dust of your feet."

The dust of a heathen country was considered by the Jews as polluting them. This is expressly taught in the Mishna, which directs a sacrifice to be made by him who is polluted with it, and is repeated in various forms by the Jewish Rabbis. This Jewish notion is here referred to by Jesus. His meaning may have been, that the Apostles, by the symbolical action of shaking off the dust of their feet, or by words equivalent to this action, should announce to the inhabitants of the place which they were leaving, that they had ceased to be of the

number of "the chosen people," that they were no better in the sight of God than they regarded the heathen. (Compare Acts xiii. 51 ; xviii. 6.) But perhaps the language of our Saviour is throughout figurative, and his sole purpose was to impress strongly on the minds of the Apostles, that such was the state of unbelieving Jews.

This is one of the instances in which our Saviour conforms his language to a popular prejudice of the Jews, without indicating its error.

15. "I tell you in truth, that, when sentence is passed upon it, it will be less tolerable for that place, than it was for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah."

In this verse Jesus refers to the account in Genesis of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, with which he compares the destruction of Jewish cities when the country should be laid waste by the Romans. The Jews were familiar with this reference to the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, as a striking example of the vengeance of Jehovah ; and it had been set before them in the Old Testament (Deut. xxix. 22 – 25) as a type of the desolation that would fall upon them, should they "forsake the covenant of the LORD, the God of their fathers." In Isaiah (i. 9) it is said, "Had not Jehovah of Hosts left us a small remnant, we had soon become as Sodom, we had been as Gomorrah." In Jeremiah (xxiii. 14) Jehovah is introduced as declaring of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, "They have become to me, all of them, as Sodom, and her inhabitants as Gomorrah." In the Lamentations (iv. 6) it is said, "The punishment of the daughter of my people has been greater than the pun-

ishment of Sodom.” And so in other places. The destruction of heathen nations is likewise compared in the Old Testament with that of Sodom and Gomorrah. In what are entitled the Second Epistle of Peter (ii. 6) and the Epistle of Jude (verse 7), the destruction of these cities is referred to in a similar manner. Josephus also, in his “Wars of the Jews” (Lib. V. c. 13. § 6), speaking of the abominable outrages perpetrated by the factions in Jerusalem, says, “I think that if the Romans had delayed to come against those villains, the city would have been swallowed up in the earth, or overwhelmed with a deluge, or destroyed by thunderbolts like Sodom.”

Jesus, in like manner, referred to the account of the destruction of those cities, comparing it with the coming desolation of the towns of Palestine. Thus he elsewhere (Luke xvii. 29, 30) compares the calamities which were about to overwhelm the Jews to the destruction of Sodom. “It shall be as in the days of Lot. On the day when Lot left Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. So will it be when the Son of Man is made manifest.”

The words of the original, verbally rendered, are, “*It will be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in a day of judgment, than for that town.*” But it is evident from the illustrations that have been given, that it was the past destruction of those ancient cities, as related in the Pentateuch, which our Lord referred to, and compared with the coming desolation of the towns of Judæa. The representation of the former as future belongs to the popular style of his discourses. The punishment that was past and the punishment to come are both presented to the imagination under one point of view; being regarded as the result of that moral government of God which ~~is~~ ever in operation, and continually passing judgment on the

evil. The words "It will be" are a rhetorical expression for "It will appear." The sense of the original might be thus given: More tolerable will it appear to have been for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, when judged, than for that town.

The words "in *a* day of judgment" — not "in *the* day of judgment" as in the Common Version — mean nothing more than "in a time of judgment," according to a common use of the word "day"; and are simply equivalent to the expression, "when judged."

Note the similar mode of expression in ch. xi. 22, 24; Mark vi. 11; Luke x. 12, 14.

16 - 22. "Lo! I send you as sheep into the midst of wolves," &c.

Matthew has apparently given this passage out of its proper place. See the corresponding passages in Mark and Luke.

19, 20. "But when they deliver you over, be not anxious as to how or what you shall speak," &c.

The disciples, being illiterate men, from the lower classes, unaccustomed to public speaking, would naturally feel great solicitude at the thought of being called on to defend themselves and their faith, before a public assembly, or before men of superior rank. But they were not to suffer themselves to be disturbed by the recollection of their former incapacity. It was not they, such as they had been, who would speak. A new spirit was to be breathed into them. God would elevate their souls, and would inform their minds with religious truth. Nor

would this be all ; they would be inspired by the consciousness, that they were his peculiar ministers, favored children of him, their “ Father.” With this confidence, this knowledge of the truth, and this moral elevation, what they should speak would always be given them ; the spirit of their Father would speak in them. It may be further observed, that, though the direction verbally is, not to be anxious *when* they should be subjected to trial, yet the purpose of the words of Jesus obviously was to prevent them from being anxious in the *anticipation* of that event.

23. “ When they persecute you in one town, fly to another,” &c.

This is not a direction to fly from persecution, but to persevere in their work, and, when driven from one place, to go to another.

“ — before the Son of Man come ” : — that is, before my religion is established and its truth fully confirmed. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

26 – 31. “ Fear them not, then. For there is nothing covered which is not to be unveiled,” &c.

The meaning of these verses is, that there were no secrets in the religion of Jesus, that he taught nothing confidentially to his disciples ; but that all which he taught was to be openly and fearlessly announced by them, however obnoxious it might be to the prejudices of men, or to whatever danger and suffering they, in common with him, might expose themselves.

The passage from verse 26 to 33 is given by Luke in a very different connection. Compare what follows in each Evangelist. See Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. pp. cxciv. – cxcvi.

29. “Are not two sparrows sold for an as?”

[The Roman *as* was originally the tenth of a denarius. Afterwards (in the second Punic war) its value was reduced to one sixteenth, and, in passages of the Talmud quoted by Wetstein, it is reckoned as the twenty-fourth of a denarius. The denarius was equal in value to about fifteen cents of our money.]

34. “Think not that I came to bring peace on earth. I came not to bring peace, but a sword.”

See Appendix, Note E, p. 521.

38. “And whoever does not follow me, bearing his cross, is not worthy of me.”

It was the custom for one condemned to crucifixion to bear his cross to the place of his execution. Our Saviour tells his followers that they must be prepared to submit, in his cause, even to a death of torture and ignominy. This declaration is one of the strong internal evidences of the truth of Christianity. Compare ch. xvi. 24. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

40. “He who welcomes you, welcomes me,” &c.

See Wetstein's notes on this verse and on Luke x. 16, in which he produces many parallel sayings from the Rabbins.

XI. 2 – 6. (John the Baptist sends two of his disciples to Jesus to inquire if he is the Messiah.)

The question proposed by John evidently implies that he

was in doubt whether Jesus were the Messiah or not.* Both Matthew and Luke represent him as having sent this message in consequence of hearing of the miracles of our Lord; thus leaving it to be inferred, that the accounts of these miracles had led John to believe it not improbable that he was really the long-expected deliverer of Israel. But the tendency to this belief in John's mind must have been strongly counteracted by the humble circumstances of our Saviour, by his not publicly assuming that character, by his not claiming for himself any worldly rank and authority, and by his taking no steps to effect those objects which the Jews believed that their Messiah would accomplish. John would likewise be led to doubt by the circumstances of his own condition; for he was in prison and in danger of his life, without any interference of Jesus for his deliverance, while, if Jesus were the Messiah, he had been the precursor of the Messiah.

From the question proposed by John, it follows that he could have had no miraculous assurance that Jesus was the Messiah. This is also rendered evident by other considerations.

The office of John appears to have been to call the Jews to reformation, to direct their thoughts to their religious state, to rouse their expectations, and thus to prepare them for the far more important and authoritative instructions of our Lord, whom he was also commissioned to announce as a teacher greatly superior to himself. But such a teacher, or prophet, our Lord might have been, without being the Messiah. There is nothing improbable in the supposition that John might have

* "Cum etiam Joannes de illo [Christo] certus esse desisset." — Tertullian. de Præscript. Hæret. c. 8. See also his treatise De Baptismo, c. 10.

regarded him as being with himself another precursor of the kingdom of Heaven, another prophet who had come to reform the people, that they might be prepared for that kingdom, or, in other words, for the advent of the Messiah. This, at a later period, appears to have been the notion of many concerning him. See Matthew xvi. 14.

John could have had no commission to proclaim to the people that our Lord was the Messiah. This would have been altogether inconsistent with the conduct of Jesus himself, who, till the very concluding scenes of his ministry, refrained from publicly and explicitly assuming that character. All the evils which would have been consequent on his announcing himself to the Jews as their Messiah, would equally have followed such an annunciation of him by John.

Such an annunciation, publicly made at the commencement of our Lord's ministry, would have conveyed to the Jews the most erroneous conceptions of his office. He was not the Messiah whom they expected. Before that title could with propriety be openly applied to him, it was necessary that his character and ministry should explain in what sense it was used,—in what sense he was *the* Anointed of God. There is, indeed, no reason to suppose that John himself had correct conceptions of the office of our Saviour, and of the design of the new dispensation. That his views of religious truth were limited and erroneous, follows from the words of our Lord, that "the humblest in the kingdom of Heaven was greater than he."

Had John received miraculous assurance that our Lord was the Messiah, he would have inculcated this truth upon his own disciples. If any circumstances or considerations had prevented him from becoming himself a professed follower of Jesus, he would at least have transferred them to our Lord. His disci-

ples, in truth, they could not have continued to be, as a body, apart from the disciples of Jesus; for in not recognizing Jesus as the Messiah, and in not becoming his followers, they would have disbelieved or disregarded the most momentous communication which their master had to make. One commissioned to announce the Messiah could have no proper followers of his own after the Messiah appeared. But we learn from this narrative, and from many others in the New Testament, that there were disciples of John, who remained a distinct body from the disciples of Jesus.

* * * * *

Add a consideration of Acts xviii. 25 – xix. 7. John iii. 26. John's imprisonment closely following the appearance of our Lord. See the Clementine Homilies.

* * * * *

10. “This is he of whom it is written, *Lo ! I send my messenger before thee, to prepare thy way.*”

Our Lord here refers to the following passage of Malachi (iii. 1) : —

“Lo ! I send my messenger,
And he shall prepare the way before me ;
And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple,
Even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye desire.”

The words of Malachi relate to an extraordinary interposition of God which he imagined would take place. As appears from what he subjoins, he supposed the purpose of this interposition would be to judge and to reform the Jewish people. By the Messenger of the Covenant whom they desired, it would seem that he must have meant that deliverer from God, that

renewer of the ancient covenant, who was expected as *the* Anointed of God or *the* Messiah. In him, in his deeds and words, God would be manifested, and therefore the messenger first spoken of in the words, "Lo! I send my messenger," might be indifferently represented as going before God or going before the Messenger of the Covenant. Our Lord, in applying the language of Malachi to himself and John, changes the pronoun *me* (denoting God) into *thee* (denoting himself, in whom God was manifested), without any change in the meaning of the passage. Compare the note on Matthew iii. 3.

It appears from the conclusion of his book, that Malachi conceived that the messenger who was to precede God, or the Messiah, would be the prophet Elijah. He says: —

"Lo! I will send you Elijah the prophet
Before the day of Jehovah come,
The great and terrible day."

The obvious meaning of these words, and the only meaning, it would seem, which they will admit, is, that Elijah, who had been translated, would be sent to reappear on earth. In this sense they have from the earliest times been generally understood by the Jews. Trypho, in his Dialogue with Justin Martyr, says: "All we Jews expect that the Messiah will be born a man, like other men, and that Elijah will come to anoint him." * "It would," says Lightfoot, "be an endless task to produce all the passages from the Jewish writings that relate to the expected coming of Elijah," — that is, his coming as the precursor and attendant of the Messiah. This expectation of the Jews is, as will be recollected, repeatedly brought into view in the Gospels.

* Dial. cum Tryph. c. 49. p. 235, ed. Thirlb. Conf. c. 8. p. 153.

In the mind of a Jew, therefore, it must have been a serious objection to acknowledging Jesus as the Messiah, that he had not been preceded and accompanied by Elijah. It was so urged by Trypho ; and it has been insisted upon in later times. It is brought forward, for instance, in the “*Munimen Fidei*,” one of the most elaborate Jewish works against Christianity, written by Rabbi Isaac ben Abraham, in the beginning of the seventeenth century. The author says, “It was well known in the Jewish nation, that the Messiah would not come till after the coming of Elijah the prophet.” It was in consequence of this general expectation of the Jews, that the Apostles who witnessed the transfiguration of our Lord immediately after “questioned him, saying, Why then do the teachers of the Law say that Elijah must first come?” (Matthew xvii. 10.) The purport of their question was this : We recognize you as the Messiah, but you have not been preceded by Elijah ; what then is to be said of the tradition of the teachers of the Law ?

In reference to this belief of the Jews, our Lord says, “This is he of whom it is written, *Lo ! I send my messenger before thee, to prepare thy way.*” His words are to be understood thus : Malachi anticipated that a messenger would come from God to prepare for the Messiah. Such a messenger has in consequence been expected by the Jews, and such a messenger has in fact appeared in the person of John. To him the words of Malachi may properly be applied.

In like manner he afterward says (verse 14), “And if you will receive it, he is the Elijah who was to come.” That is to say, Elijah has been expected as the precursor of the Messiah ; but John has been the precursor of the Messiah ; if you will receive it, he is the Elijah who was to come.

12. "The kingdom of Heaven is forcing its way, and the violent are seizing upon it."

"— is forcing its way," *βιάζεται*. On the use of this word see Loesner ad loc. See also Clement. Alex. Opp. p. 31, l. 37 ; p. 484, l. 3 ; p. 891, l. 40.

It is probable that the report of this discourse given by the Evangelist is imperfect, so that the connection and meaning are obscured in consequence, particularly in the present passage. There is perhaps no more likely supposition than that the words, "and the violent are seizing upon it," are parenthetical, and refer to those Jews who, with their false notions of the Messiah as a deliverer from the tyranny of the Romans, were eager to enlist as followers of Jesus, without possessing any of the dispositions required in his disciples. — See the note on Luke xvi. 14–18.

18. "John came, not eating nor drinking."

[This passage affords a striking illustration of the difference between the Oriental modes of expression and our own.] "These words, as spoken by our Saviour, had nothing of the paradoxical character which would belong to them, if now uttered for the first time in our own language. They meant only that John, leading an ascetic life, refrained from taking food after the common fashion, at regular meals." — *Statements of Reasons*, p. 95.

19. "Yet wisdom is honored by her children."

"— is honored," *ἐδικαιώθη*. Compare Luke vii. 29.

21. “Alas for thee, Chorazin! Alas for thee, Bethsaida! For if in old times the miracles had been done in Tyre and Sidon,” &c.

“— in old times,” *πάλαι*. It is unimportant, as regards the sense, in which clause of the sentence this accessory idea is introduced. In a translation it may be best arranged in the first. The common mode of rendering is incorrect, as suggesting the idea of the existence of the cities in the time of the speaker.

THERE is no remembrance either of Bethsaida or Chorazin in the country where they once stood, nor is either mentioned by Josephus. Jerome, in his Translation of the work of Eusebius, “*De Situ et Nominibus Locorum Hebræorum*,” says, that Chorazin stood at the second mile-stone from Capernaum, that is, north of Capernaum, (the mile-stones being reckoned from Tarichiæ or Tiberias,) and, as I suppose, in the plain of Genesaret. Eusebius, according to his present text, says it was distant twelve miles from Capernaum; but this is generally regarded as an error of transcription. Such a distance would carry it off from the shore of the lake of Galilee, on which Jerome elsewhere says it stood. Its mention in connection with Bethsaida leads us to suppose that they were in the neighborhood of each other. It was deserted in the time of Eusebius, as he informs us. This fact determines that Chorazin could not have been another name for the city of Julias, at the northern extremity of the lake, as some have conjectured.

Bethsaida (as appears from a comparison of Matthew xiv. 34, Mark vi. 45 – 53, and John vi. 17, 24, 59) was also on the western shore of the lake of Galilee, near Capernaum.

“It is remarkable that we have no account of Jesus having ever visited Chorazin or Bethsaida.” — Priestley.

23. “And thou, Capernaum, that hast been raised to heaven.”

This refers to the peculiar privilege which Capernaum had enjoyed as being the principal place of residence of our Lord.

25. “Those things which thou hast hidden from the wise and understanding, thou hast revealed to the simple.”

The meaning of our Saviour is, that God had now, through him, revealed to the simple those religious truths which in the common course of his providence had not hitherto been ascertained by the wise and understanding. The thought is similar to that in ch. xiii. 17. On the idiom in this verse, see the note on ch. vii. 22, 23.

26. “Yea, Father, such has been thy goodness.”

Eὐδοκία, “benevolent will,” “benevolence,” “goodness,” as elsewhere.

27. “I have been instructed in all by my Father; and no one knows the Son but the Father.”

“I have been instructed in all”: — that is, in all those religious truths spoken of in verse 25.

“And no one knows the Son”: — no one yet comprehends his true character and office.

28–30. “Come to me, all you who are laboring under heavy burdens,” &c.

After thus announcing the high nature and benevolent pur-

pose of his mission, Jesus calls upon all those burdened with their superstitions and sins to become his followers. They would find him a religious teacher mild and of a humble spirit; very different from the teachers of the Law to whom they had been accustomed.

“Take my yoke upon you”: — that is, Submit yourselves to me. The figure in this sense appears to have been very familiar to the Jews.

XII. 1-8. (Account of the disciples' plucking ears of grain to eat on the Sabbath.)

“‘Whoever does any work on the Sabbath shall surely be put to death,’ is a law repeatedly given in Exodus.* ‘Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your dwellings on the Sabbath.’ † In Numbers ‡ we read that a man was found gathering sticks on the Sabbath; ‘and the Lord said to Moses, This man shall surely be put to death; the whole congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp.’ So strict, according to the Levitical Law, was to be the observance of the Sabbath, and so fearful a crime was any breach of the statute represented to be. §

* Ch. xxxi. 14; xxxv. 2.

† Exodus xxxv. 3.

‡ Ch. xv. 32-36.

§ “Philo speaks of the law respecting the Jewish Sabbath, as ‘that most holy and awful law.’ He relates, that a governor of Egypt, in his time, had endeavored to compel the Jews to violate it, thinking that, if this could be effected, it would lead them to abandon all their peculiar customs, and neglect all the ordinances of their religion.” — *De Somniis*. Opp. I. 675, as quoted in the *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. p. cl.

“ But Jesus repeatedly disregarded or countenanced the disregard of the law respecting the Sabbath ; and he did so at the hazard of his life. But it is not to be imagined that he thus manifested his disregard for that law wantonly, or that such hazard was encountered without the purpose of effecting some important end. What, then, could this end be, except to teach indirectly the superstitious character of such observances as the Levitical Law required, and especially of such representations concerning the extreme guilt of neglecting them as that Law presented ? Let us attend to some of the examples.

“ When, as he was passing through a field of grain on the Sabbath,* his disciples gathered the ears of grain and ate them, and the Pharisees said, ‘ Lo ! your disciples are doing what the Law forbids on the Sabbath,’ his reply, it is to be observed, did not contradict their assertion. But, for the obvious reasons before given, he could not *directly* tell them that this Law was not from God, and was not binding upon men. What, then, did he say ? He first made one of those annunciations of his high character and of the sanctity of his office which were so necessary to the accomplishment of his ministry. David, their great monarch, the supposed type of the Messiah, had broken the Law, when himself and his companions were hungry ; and what David had done without censure he might do without censure. The priests performed their work in the temple on the Sabbath, notwithstanding the Law ; and those who addressed him were in the presence of ‘ one greater than the temple.’ In such declarations there is no recognition of the divine authority of the Law, and still less in what follows. ‘ But had you known what this means, *I desire goodness and not sacrifices,*

* Matthew xii. 1 – 8 ; Mark ii. 23 – 28 ; Luke vi. 1 – 5.

you would not have condemned the guiltless.' These words imply that such an observance of the Sabbath as the Law enforced in a manner so terrific had not been required by God, and was not acceptable to him. 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.' The general truth involved in this declaration is, that what God requires man to do is for the benefit of man; he demands no slavish observance of mere ceremonies. 'So that the Son of Man is master even of the Sabbath': — So that I, the messenger of God, have a right to dispense with such ceremonies." — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. Additional Note D, Section VII. "On the Inferences respecting the Levitical Law and the Pentateuch, to be drawn from the Teaching and Actions of our Saviour," pp. clxviii. — clxx.

For remarks on other passages in the Gospels relating to this subject, as Matthew xii. 9 – 14, Luke xiii. 10 – 17, John v. 1 – 16 and vii. 19 – 23, see what follows the passage just quoted.

1. "About that time Jesus was passing, on the Sabbath, through a field of grain."

On the date of this occurrence, see Appendix, Note B, pp. 491, 492.

Near Tiberias, on June 19th, 1838, "the people were yet engaged," says Dr. Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, III. 252) "in gathering the harvest on the plain," — the wheat harvest. See also the same work, III. 265.

9. "And departing thence, he entered their synagogue."

This was not on the same, but on another Sabbath, as is said by Luke (vi. 6).

Their synagogue, or, as it is called by Mark and Luke, *the* synagogue, from the definite manner in which it is spoken of, we may conclude to be the synagogue of Capernaum; especially as Mark says (iii. 1) he entered it *again*, and has not previously mentioned his being in any other than that at Capernaum. Compare Luke vii. 5; viii. 41.

11, 12. "Who among you that owns a sheep," &c.

The meaning is, You do not consider the obligation to keep the Sabbath as prohibiting you from doing what may benefit an inferior animal; how much less should it prevent me from miraculously conferring a benefit upon this man!

But Mark and Luke relate this transaction differently, and their account seems more accurate; the words of Jesus, as reported by them, having a direct and striking reference to the particular circumstances in which he was placed. Matthew, on the other hand, not adverting to what was peculiar in this instance, merely ascribes to him such language as he used on other similar occasions, as appears from Luke xiii. 15, xv. 5.

14. "Then the Pharisees went out and concerted means to destroy him."

The Pharisees concerted means to destroy Jesus, upon the pretence that, having broken the Sabbath, he was liable to death according to the Law of Moses. See Exodus xxxi. 14, 15; Numbers xv. 32 – 36.

22. "After this, a blind and dumb dæmoniac was brought to him," &c.

The narrative of Mark (iii. 20 – iv. 34) relates to the

same events and discourses as that of Matthew from the 22d verse of this chapter to the 52d verse of the next. Luke (xi. 14–28) gives in a very abridged form the narrative which fills the remainder of this chapter, and then, instead of the parables that follow, to three of which he assigns a different place, gives another discourse.

27. “And if I cast out dæmons through Beelzebub, through whom do your disciples cast them out?”

An example of our Saviour’s arguing *ad hominem*, from the false notions of the Jews. See Appendix, Note D, p. 513.

Respecting the Jewish exorcists see Whitby’s note.

30. “He who is not with me, is against me,” &c.

These words appear to have been addressed to the multitude, many of whom, doubtless, were wavering between him and the Pharisees, to whose authority they had been accustomed to defer.

32. “And he who speaks against the Son of Man may be forgiven, but he who speaks against the Spirit of God will not be forgiven, either now or hereafter.”

Jesus here refers to the blindness and guilt of the Pharisees in ascribing the miracle he had just wrought to Satan. See Mark iii. 30. It is as if he said, It is not because you calumniate *me* that I pronounce you guilty of an unpardonable sin. You might speak evil of me personally, and be forgiven; but

you defame the manifest power of God. You shut your eyes to the clearest light, and no more can be done for you; there is no hope of you, now or hereafter. Our Saviour does not mean that there is any sin which God will not forgive on condition of repentance and reformation; but that the Pharisees, in ascribing his cure of the dæmoniac to Satan, had shown a depravity and wilful blindness which left no ground to hope that they would ever reform. He uses the unqualified language of strong feeling. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

36. “For every vile word which men speak, they will give account in a day of judgment.”

“It is as if he said, It is not for your *injurious actions* alone, but your *calumniating aspersions* also, that you shall be brought to judgment.” * — Dr. Jebb in Priestley’s Notes.

38. “Teacher, we wish to see a sign from you.”

By a sign is evidently meant some marvel which should afford unequivocal proof that our Lord was what he claimed to be. We must understand the words, not as expressing a re-

* *Μάταιος* is used by Herodotus in a similar manner to that in which *ἀργός* is employed here. Artabanus, for example, says to Mardonius, *Σὺ δὲ παῦσαι λέγων λόγους ματαίους περὶ Ἑλλήνων* (Lib. VII. c. 10. § 7); upon which Schweighæuser remarks, “Dicit non modo vanos et temere jactatos sermones, sed et injuriosos, sicut cap. 15. 5 [where Xerxes tells Artabanus, *Οὐκ ἐσωφρύνεον εἶπας ἐς σὲ μάταια ἔπεα χρηστῆς εἵνεκα συμβουλίας*], et III. 120. 4 [where it is said that Orætes wished to destroy Polycrates, though he had received no injury from him; *οὔτε γάρ τι παθών, οὔτε ἀκούσας μάταιον ἔπος*], VI. 68. 7.” Compare also Lib. VII. c. 11.

quest, but as uttered with a sneer, and intended to convey distinctly the implication, that the miracles which Jesus had performed afforded no sign of his being authorized to speak in the name of God. Those who now addressed him had, in the commencement of the conversation, ascribed his miracles to the agency of Satan.

But in doing so, they had spoken evil of the power of God; and our Lord in consequence used concerning them the strongest language of reproof and denunciation. The feeling and purpose in their asking for a sign might perhaps have been more fully expressed as follows:— You speak in the boldest tone of authority, threatening us, who regard you as a false prophet. But give us some proof, other than those prodigies which, as we believe, Satan has enabled you to perform, that you are entitled to be listened to. Teacher, we wish to see a sign from you.

39, 40. “ A wicked and apostate race would have a sign ; but no sign will be given it, except the sign of Jonah the prophet. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, so will the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.”

“ The words of our Lord are thus reported by Luke (xi. 29, 30) :— ‘ This is a wicked race. It would have a sign ; but no sign will be given it, except the sign of Jonah. For such a sign as Jonah was to the Ninevites will the Son of Man be to this race.’

“ If we regard what is given by Luke as a correct report of what was said by Jesus, we may suppose that the explanation

of the sign of Jonah, by a comparison of his being three days in the belly of a fish with our Lord's being three days and three nights in a tomb, which is found in Matthew, but not in Luke, was introduced into our Lord's discourse during the time that it was preserved by oral tradition. His own brief words leaving his meaning undefined, they were understood by some as referring to the extraordinary marvel related in the story of Jonah ; and, being so understood, this explanation became connected with them. There seems to be no reason for supposing that it was inserted in Matthew's Gospel by any other than the Evangelist himself.

“ But it cannot readily be believed that our Lord would have represented his being three days and three nights in the heart of the earth as the only sign of his divine mission to be given to the Jews. This would have been admitting what they had just implied, that no sign of his divine mission had already been given them.

“ Nor, if we regard as fabulous the story that Jonah remained alive for three days and three nights in a fish by which he had been swallowed, is it credible that our Lord would have referred to a fiction of this sort in the manner represented ; — especially, as it does not appear from the narrative concerning Jonah, that the supposed miracle was any sign to the Ninevites, or was even known to them.

“ It may be added, that our Lord is made to say, that he would be three days and three nights in the tomb. He was, in fact, laid in the tomb on the night of Friday, probably late at night, and rose before the dawn of Sunday morning ; — and no use of language can be produced which may justify the calling of such a period of time three days and three nights. Its being so called can, I think, be accounted for only by the loose

manner in which the Jews were wont to accommodate together passages of the Old Testament, and events of which they regarded those passages as descriptive, prophetic, or typical. Of this it is not a remarkable example.

“The meaning of the words of Jesus as reported by Luke, and also by Matthew, with the omission of those under consideration, may be thus explained : —

“Jesus was surrounded by men full of bigotry, evil passions, and mortal hatred toward himself, — men who were resisting the strongest evidences of his divine mission, ascribing his miracles to the agency of Satan, and demanding in mockery some sign of his divine mission, some manifestation of God’s power in attestation of it, as if the most striking attestations of it had not been already given. His view turned to that destruction of their nation which was impending over the Jews, as the punishment of their rejection of him. No sign, he says, will be given to this wicked and apostate race, no manifestation of God’s power will be made to them which they will believe and feel to be such, except a prophet of destruction such as Jonah was to the Ninevites, whose warnings — to pursue the train of thought which was in the mind of our Lord — will be disregarded, and whose predictions of ruin will be accomplished.

“Thus he immediately subjoins : ‘Men of Nineveh will stand before the judgment-seat with this race, and will condemn it ; for they reformed upon the preaching of Jonah ; and lo ! a greater than Jonah is here.’

“However fabulous may be the story of Jonah, there was nothing unsuitable to our Lord’s character in thus using it. Speakers and writers of every age and country have recurred to well-known works of fiction as readily as to authentic history

for analogies and exemplifications fitted to affect the imaginations of their hearers or readers. It would be folly to suppose that, in doing so, they meant to vouch for the truth of the books which they have thus quoted. It is only in the reasonings of divines that these facts have been overlooked, — in those reasonings in which our Lord and the writers of the New Testament have been considered as giving their authority for the truth and for the genuineness of all books referred to or quoted by them.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. lxxi. — lxxiii, note †.

41. “Men of Nineveh will stand before the judgment-seat with this race, and will condemn it.”

“ — will stand before the judgment-seat ” : — verbally, “ will rise in the trial.” By “ the trial ” is literally meant that discrimination between the good and bad which is continually taking effect under the moral government of God. The imagery used by our Lord is conformed to the conception of a trial before a human tribunal. The men of Nineveh, as, afterward, the Queen of Sheba, are represented as being present for judgment together with the unbelieving Jews. When it is said, that they will “ condemn this race,” the meaning is, that they will show the depravity of this race by the contrast of their conduct. In English, we do not commonly use the verb “ condemn ” in this metaphorical sense, but a corresponding sense is not unfrequently given to the noun “ condemnation.” Thus, according to common usage, we may speak of one person as feeling the conduct of another as a condemnation of his own.

43. “When a foul spirit has gone out of a man, it passes through deserts in search of a resting-place.”

Another example of language founded upon the popular superstitions of the Jews. See Appendix, Note D, p. 512.

45. “And the last state of the man is worse than the first. So will it be with this evil race.”

“The evil race spoken of was the great body of the Jews. The nation is compared to an incurable madman, who, after an interval of quiet, relapses into more violent insanity. The figure was suggested by the cure of the dæmoniac, which gave occasion to the discourse. To understand its application, we must consider that the Jews, since their return from the Babylonish captivity, had not fallen into idolatry, and did not regard themselves as exposed to punishment from God. They thought themselves much better than their countrymen of former times. They said, ‘If we had lived in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partners with them in slaying the Prophets.’ But they hated and were about to cause the death of Jesus, the greatest of God’s messengers to their nation, and to display their enmity toward his disciples, as their fathers had persecuted and put to death their religious teachers. They were about to manifest the same disobedience to God which their predecessors had done, in a manner still more outrageous. The interval of seeming amendment in the nation was no real change for the better. The evil spirit had returned, and found his house prepared for his reception, and entered in with seven other spirits worse than himself.

“In Luke (xi. 24 – 26), the passage remarked upon appears almost in the same words. But he, after giving a portion of our Saviour’s first reply to the Pharisees, immediately subjoins this passage, separated from its proper connection, and without anything to explain it, for even the last sentence, ‘So will it be with this evil race,’ is omitted. It would be impossible from Luke’s Gospel alone to determine its reference and ultimate meaning.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. ccv, ccvi.

46. “While he was yet addressing the multitude, lo ! his mother and his kinsmen were standing without, wishing to speak with him.”

Luke (viii. 19 – 21) relates this incident in a different connection from that in which it is given by Matthew and Mark, but has, I think, preserved an indication of its happening at this time by what he says in ch. xi. 27, 28.

Respecting the kinsmen of Jesus, see the note on ch. xiii. 55.

48. “Who is my mother ? and who are my kinsmen ? ”

His mother and kinsmen probably thought he was exposing himself to danger, and wished to caution him. His answer, which may at first view appear harsh, was doubtless intended to show them that they were not to interfere with him in the performance of the duties of his ministry. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*

XIII. 2. “And great multitudes collected round him, so that he got into the boat and sat there.”

The definite expression, “*the* boat,” (resembling that of “*the*

house" remarked upon in the note on ch. ix. 28,) must denote the particular boat which Jesus commonly used; and it is not improbable that this boat was Peter's, as well as the house in which our Lord commonly resided when at Capernaum.

This mode of speaking of "*the* boat" is found in Matthew and Mark, and also in John, but not in Luke.

11. "Because to you it is given to know the new doctrines of the kingdom of Heaven."

"The word *μυστήριον*," in the Common Version "rendered *mystery*, is, in its primary signification, best translated by the word *secret*. When used in the New Testament respecting any doctrine or truth, it means one which has been secret or unknown, but is now revealed. It never denotes one which is obscure or mysterious because partially incomprehensible. The term *new doctrine*, in general, answers to its meaning as nearly as any which can be conveniently used." — *On the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Christian Examiner, Vol. V p. 67.

By "the kingdom" or "the reign of Heaven" in this discourse and elsewhere, is sometimes meant that new state of things which Jesus was sent to produce, in which men should become obedient subjects of God; and sometimes, the moral government of God, in the general sense of those words. (See the note on verse 24.) Thus in English both these ideas may be expressed by the corresponding term, "the reign" or "rule of God"; as we may say, in a special sense, of a community eminently religious, "Here God rules"; or, in a more general sense, "God rules over all." But as the Jews understood by the kingdom of Heaven a temporal kingdom to be established

by their Messiah, they consequently did not comprehend some of the parables used by Jesus concerning it.

12. “For to him who has, more will be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him who has not, will be taken away even what he has.”

This proverbial expression, in its general application, means, that he who has right dispositions will be continually growing better, while he who has not right dispositions will be continually growing worse. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

13. “Hence it is that I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor understand.”

What may be considered as the true meaning of these words is not obvious at first sight. His disciples had asked Jesus why he spoke to the multitude in parables. They had perceived, without doubt, that he was not understood; and the intent of their question was to ask, Why do you speak to them in language which they do not comprehend? This mode of instruction being obscure, why do you use it? And the question was natural; for with a parable the notion of some obscurity was commonly associated.* The purport, therefore, of the answer of Jesus appears to be, that the difficulty was not in his manner of teaching, but in the minds of his hearers; that what he said was in itself plain, but that it was unintelligi-

* Thus Clement of Alexandria says, ἡ οἰκονομία πᾶσα ἡ περὶ τὸν Κύριον προφητευθεῖσα, παραβολὴ ὥς ἀληθῶς φαίνεται τοῖς μὴ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐγνωκόσι — *Stromat.* VI. c. 15. *Opp.* p. 804. l. 8.

ble to them ; that he spoke in parables, that is, obscurely, to them, because their minds were occupied by such erroneous prepossessions, that hearing they did not understand, and seeing they did not perceive. See the corresponding passages, Mark iv. 11, 12 ; Luke viii. 10.

24. “The kingdom of Heaven has been compared to a man sowing good seed in his field.”

The different manner in which Jesus introduced his parables has been remarked,* and deserves observation. Here and in two other instances, ch. xviii. 23, and ch. xxii. 2, he says, “The kingdom of Heaven has been compared to —,” as, I believe, his words should be rendered. Elsewhere he says, “The kingdom of Heaven is like —.” In the first three cases he intends, as I suppose, by “the kingdom of Heaven” the moral government of God, and means by the expression “it has been compared to” that it has already been illustrated by the comparison which he uses. Of this fact we discover proof in the Jewish writings. Thus, as regards the parable of the tares, we find the following passage in the Talmud. “The earth is corrupt ; wheat was sown in it, and it produced tares ; those tares were multiplied in the time of the Deluge.” So also there are passages in the Rabbinical writings corresponding to what is found in the eighteenth chapter, and two parables strikingly resembling that in the twenty-second. — The coincidence is one among the minor circumstances which contribute to satisfy us of the genuineness of the Gospels ; and it is worthy of attention that it occurs in Matthew, who appears to have written especially for Jewish readers, some of whom might be expected

* See Bishop Pearce's Commentary.

to observe the agreement between the parables and comparisons of Jesus, and such as had been previously employed.

25. “His enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat.”

Is “tares” the correct rendering? [The weed denoted by the word used in the original* is probably darnel, *Lolium temulentum*, the “infelix lolium” of Virgil. See Campbell’s note. But supposing this to be the case, it may still be doubted whether it would be well to change the rendering.]

32. “—which, though the least of all seeds, yet, when it has grown up, is the greatest of herbs, and becomes a tree.”

“—becomes a tree”: — that is, becomes like a tree, an Oriental expression to denote that the mustard plant grows to a very large size compared to the smallness of the seed from which it springs.

[It may be, however, that it is not the common mustard plant which is intended, but a large shrub, the *Salvadora Persica*, which is said to grow abundantly on the banks of the Jordan

* [Ζιζάνιον. This word is rare. In Kitto’s Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, art. *Zizanion*, it is said that “it is not found in any Greek author”; and no example of its use by any such author is cited in the Lexicons to the Greek Testament. It occurs repeatedly, however, in the Geoponica, where the plant is thus described in a fragment of Paxamus: Τὸ ζιζάνιον, τὸ λεγόμενον αἶρα, φθείρει τὸν σῖτον, ἀρτοῖς δὲ μίγνυμένη σκοτοῖ τοὺς ἐσθίοντας. — Lib. II. c. 13. See the note of Niclas, and compare Lib. XIV. c. 1. § 5; c. 7. § 3.]

and the shores of the lake of Galilee, as well as in India, Persia, and Arabia. This plant has a small seed, possessed of the same properties, and used for the same purposes, as common mustard, and in Arabic bears the same name, *khardal*, corresponding with the name *chardel* given to the mustard plant by the Talmudists. See the article *Sinapi* (by Dr. J. F. Royle) in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. See also, for an interesting description of the plant, Irby and Mangles's Travels, pp. 354, 355, or p. 108 of the smaller edition.]

33. "Three measures of meal."

This was probably the quantity usually or often taken in making bread. See Genesis xviii. 6; Judges vi. 19; 1 Samuel i. 24. The three measures specified in the original were equal to the *ephah* mentioned in the last two passages referred to.

36-43. (Our Lord's representation of himself as the minister of God's judgments.)

Jesus here represents himself as the agent in administering the moral government of God. The Son of Man, it is said, will send his angels to make the discrimination which is hereafter to take place between the good and the bad. The language is of the same character as is elsewhere found; as, for example, ch. xvi. 27, xxv. 31-46, and John v. 22, where it is said: "Nor does the Father condemn any one, but has committed all condemnation to the Son." The use of such language may be thus explained.

Jesus was commissioned by God to announce the rules of his moral government, laws obligatory on all, rewards to which all

should aspire, and punishments to which all are exposed. Figuratively, he was appointed by God to be the lawgiver of the human race, as Moses was the lawgiver of the Jews. Him all were to obey. He was, as it were, king over all. He spoke in the name and with the authority of God. What he required was enforced, what he promised was to be conferred, by the power of God; of which the Jews conceived angels to be the ministers. The angels of God were his angels, to be employed in his service. The condition of men was to be determined by the conformity of their actions to his laws. By his laws, or, in figurative language, by him, they were to be judged.

When Jesus uses such language as this in the parable, he is not to be understood as speaking of himself personally. He speaks of the eternal rules of action and sanctions of duty which he was appointed to proclaim, or, in other words, of his religion, which he personifies under the figure of himself. The reason of his using such language is to be found in the circumstances in which he was placed, in the necessity of addressing his hearers through the medium of striking imagery, and, especially, of repelling in the most decisive and authoritative manner the charge brought against him by the leading men of his nation, that he was a blasphemous impostor. To this end he asserted his claims to divine authority under every variety of form, and in the boldest figures. He here speaks of himself as the minister of God's judgments, to convey to the minds of his hearers in the most effectual manner the simple truth that God would judge as he taught.

In this parable, in speaking of Satan as the source of moral evil, and of the angels as ministers of God's providence, he adapts his language to the conceptions of the Jews.

The term rendered “the end of present things” was familiar to the Jews, and was used by them to denote, not the end of the world, but the end of the state of things preceding the Messiah’s kingdom upon his coming to reign. But it is clear that, as used by Jesus, it is not to be understood in the same sense. He, I conceive, intends by it the time when men shall successively pass from this state into the future, when a discrimination which does not now exist shall be made between the good and the bad. The modes of expression which represent this discrimination, not as continually going on, but as made once for all at the end of the existing state of the world, are merely imagery conformed to the notions of the Jews.

See, further, Appendix, Note E.

55. “And his kinsmen, James and Joses and Simon and Judas?”

The kinsmen here named appear to have been cousins of Jesus, as being sons of Mary who was the wife of Alpheus or Clopas, and who is designated by John (xix. 25) as the sister of Mary, the mother of our Lord. This may appear from what follows.

The word rendered “brothers” in the Common Version, when used to express consanguinity, is not limited in its sense like that English word, but may be applied to cousins. I have accordingly here and in the other passages to be quoted used the word “kinsmen” as its equivalent.

The names Clopas and Alpheus, though their spelling is as unlike in Greek as in English, are probably only different modes of expressing in the former language the same Hebrew name. Clopas and Alpheus are the same person.

These facts being premised, it is to be remarked that one of the two Apostles who were named James is distinguished as the son of Alpheus in the list of the Apostles given by each of the first three Evangelists, and by Luke in the first chapter of the Acts. Mary the wife of Alpheus is designated by Matthew and Mark as the mother of James and Joses, the two names first mentioned in the passage before us as those of kinsmen of Jesus. See Matthew xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40. By Mark, elsewhere (xvi. 1), and by Luke (xxiv. 10), she is called the mother of James. In the Epistle to the Galatians (i. 19) Paul says: "But I saw no other of the Apostles, except James, the kinsman" ('brother' in the Common Version) "of the Lord." He must here refer to the Apostle James, the son of Alpheus. John, as above referred to, calls the wife of Alpheus sister to our Lord's mother. Her children, therefore, would be his kinsmen; and conformably to this, we find James so named by St. Paul. It thus appears that James, one of the Apostles, and Joses his brother, both sons of Alpheus, were two of our Lord's kinsmen.

But, furthermore, Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians (ix. 5) speaks of kinsmen of Jesus. To render verbally, he asks: "Have I not a right to carry about a sister" (a Christian woman) "as a wife, like the other Apostles, and the kinsmen of the Lord, and Cephas?" As kinsmen of the Lord are here named between the general mention of Apostles and the particular mention of the Apostle Peter, we may infer that the kinsmen referred to were also Apostles. The words of Paul would, I believe, be correctly represented in English by rendering them, "Have I not a right like the other Apostles, even the kinsmen of the Lord, and Peter?" Hence it appears that there were more than one kinsman of Jesus among the Apostles.

In accordance with this, Luke, in mentioning one of the Apostles who was called Judas (Luke vi. 16, Acts i. 13), designates him from his relation to an individual of the name of James. He calls him, as his words have been commonly understood, "Judas, *the brother* of James," that is, of James the son of Alpheus. According to the more common usage in Greek, the words would mean, "the son of James," but they may have the former meaning. And that the former is their true meaning appears from the fact that kinsmen of Jesus are mentioned by Paul as among the Apostles. It appears also from the Epistle ascribed to Jude, that is, Judas, which, though I believe it to be supposititious, was, if supposititious, written early in the second century under the character of the Apostle. In the commencement of this Epistle Judas is designated as the brother of James. This, therefore, to say the least, was the tradition concerning him about half a century after his death.

Thus we find three children of Alpheus and Mary, kinsmen of Jesus, whose names were James, Joses, and Judas. These names belong also to the kinsmen of Jesus, mentioned in the passage before us. And as it is not to be supposed, without any evidence to countenance the supposition, that he had two sets of kinsmen, each composed of brothers, of whom three in one set had respectively the same name as three in the other, there seems no reason to doubt that the kinsmen mentioned in the passage before us were sons of Alpheus and Mary.

Two of these, James and Judas, were Apostles. The name of Simon, here given as that of one of his kinsmen, completing the four mentioned, occurs likewise in the list of the Apostles. But we are ignorant whether Simon the kinsman of our Lord was Simon the Apostle, since the latter is never so designated

as to determine the question. Yet as two of his brothers were Apostles, it becomes not an improbable conjecture, when we find the name belonging to him in the list, that he was an Apostle also. [This supposition is confirmed by the position of Simon's name in the four lists of the Apostles, Matthew x. 2 – 4, Mark iii. 16 – 19, Luke vi. 14 – 16, and Acts i. 13. Luke, it will be observed, in both of his lists, places the name of Simon between that of James the son of Alpheus and that of Judas.]

It has been an opinion, of which we find the first notice in Origen, in the third century, that the persons spoken of in this passage were brothers of Jesus in a certain sense, as being sons of Joseph by a wife to whom he was married before being married to Mary. But if the preceding statements be correct, this is a wholly gratuitous and unnecessary conjecture. It is very improbable, that, if such had been the fact, we should have found no notice or intimation of it in the New Testament. If Alpheus had three sons, named James, Joses, and Judas, kinsmen of Jesus, it would be a coincidence so extraordinary as not to be readily believed, that Joseph, the putative father of Jesus, should also have had three sons with the same names, who might also be called brothers or kinsmen of Jesus.

Similar considerations apply to another opinion, that the individuals spoken of were children of Mary, born after the birth of Jesus. But to this there is further the decisive objection, that, if she had had children of her own living, our Lord would not at his death have committed her to the care of John. This fact, it is to be observed, likewise proves that Joseph was not living at the time.

58. “And he did not perform many miracles there, on account of their want of faith.”

It may be objected, that, the greater the incredulity, the more

necessary or proper it was for our Saviour to perform miracles as a proof of his divine commission. But the want of faith of the Nazarenes did not arise from doubts of his power to perform marvellous works, any more than that of the other unbelieving Jews by whom his miracles were actually witnessed. They imply their belief in his ability to do such works by their question, "Whence has this man such mighty powers?" or, as the words may be rendered, "such miracles." It was not, therefore, to be expected, that Jesus should perform "many miracles" before them, since by doing so he could afford them no proof of his divine authority but such as they had already rejected and were prepared to reject. They were in no state of mind to witness them with proper feelings, or to be suitably impressed by them.

XIV. 1 - 12. "About that time Herod the tetrarch heard the fame of Jesus, and said to his attendants, This is John the Baptist; he has been raised from the dead; and hence he has such extraordinary powers," &c.

Preceding this narrative, Mark and Luke insert an account of the sending forth of the Apostles.

With the account ch. xiv. seqq. compare Luke xiii. 31, seqq.

According to Josephus (*Antiq. Jud. Lib. XVIII. c. 5. § 2*) John was put to death by Herod, in consequence of Herod's fear of his exciting commotion among the people. A strong excitement and a disposition to rise against the Roman power, on which that of Herod rested, must have been produced by John's announcing that the kingdom of Heaven was

at hand. But to the cause assigned by Josephus it appears that another was added, the enmity of Herodias.

From the account of Mark (vi. 20) we may conclude that Herod's feelings toward John had been different at different times. John's authority with the people gave him influence with the tetrarch, and Herod, desirous, as he probably was, to free himself from his thralldom to the Romans, may have hoped that John might, in some way, become an instrument toward effecting that purpose. It is not an improbable conjecture, that John's condemnation of Herod's marriage was in consequence of Herod's attempting to win him over to sanction it, that thus the odium which he had brought upon himself might, in part at least, be removed. The immediate occasion of John's death may either have been simply such as is related by Matthew and Mark; or the circumstances which they relate may have been concerted between Herod and his wife, in order that he might have the appearance of putting John to death unwillingly, and thus escape in some measure the reprobation to which he would otherwise be exposed.

The language of Herod concerning Jesus was used, according to the Evangelists, immediately after John's death. The conversation at Herod's court concerning John, which would follow that event, could hardly fail to introduce conversation about Jesus. But to Herod Jesus would be equally an object of apprehension with John. On hearing the reports concerning him, he said, as we may suppose, with alarm and vexation, This is John the Baptist come to life again, endued with more than mortal power through his abode with the dead. His words are not, I suppose, to be regarded as a literal expression of opinion, but as the language of an irritated man, to be taken in an obvious figurative sense. What he meant to say was,

that Jesus was John the Baptist come back again, and would cause equal trouble.

We have no reason to suppose that the Evangelists had any other foundation than common rumor for their accounts of what took place in the court of Herod, and of the language which he used. But it appears probable that others, as well as Herod, used the language ascribed to him, in the figurative sense that has been explained, meaning that Jesus was another John the Baptist. It is possible, however, that this figurative language was understood literally by the less informed, some of whom, in consequence, believed Jesus to be properly John the Baptist returned to life. That such was actually the case has been inferred from Matthew xvi. 14, and the parallel passages. The rude conceptions, the superstition, and the ignorance of the events both in the life of our Saviour and in that of John, which are implied in this belief, are supposable in such a state of society as that of the Jews, with the very imperfect means which existed of spreading information,—very imperfect everywhere among ancient nations, compared with those enjoyed at the present day, but particularly so, without doubt, among the Jews of Galilee.

13. “And when Jesus heard of it, he removed thence, in the boat, to a solitary place, apart. But the multitudes, hearing of it, followed him on foot from the towns.”

We cannot suppose, with some commentators, that Jesus withdrew himself at this time to be out of danger from Herod, since it appears from John (ch. vi.), that he returned to Capernaum, and continued (that is, the greater part of the

time) in Galilee. See also verse 34 of this chapter, and Mark vi. 53.

The mention of John's death by the first three Evangelists immediately before their account of our Lord's withdrawing to a solitary place, where he fed the five thousand,* implies a relation between the two events, which is expressly indicated by Matthew in saying, "When Jesus heard of it," that is, of John's death. Were there not a relation between those events, the mention of John's death would stand unconnected with anything that precedes or follows it.

Mark assigns as a reason for our Lord's withdrawing himself, that "so many were coming and going" that he and his disciples "had no opportunity even to take food." The news of John's execution probably produced a sudden excitement among the people, and a feeling of strong resentment,—for "all believed John to be a prophet,"—and might powerfully tend to turn their attention on Jesus, and direct their hopes to him as their expected king. John's disciples came to tell him of it, his own Apostles collected about him, and the multitude flocked to him.

From this excited multitude, eager to force on him an office so foreign from that which he was appointed to sustain, our Lord was desirous of withdrawing himself, till their passions should subside, and he should, in consequence, be able with less difficulty to repress their misdirected zeal. He probably wished also to withdraw his disciples, who were very likely to share in the popular ferment.

He therefore passed over from Galilee to the other side of the lake, into the dominions of Philip, a part of the country

* See Mark vi. 31; Luke ix. 10.

where he appears to have spent but little time during his ministry. Here, however, a great number of persons soon collected, whom he fed miraculously.

The performance of this miracle, with its effect on the multitude, which our Lord must have foreseen, may seem inconsistent with the reasons that have just been assigned for his leaving Galilee.

But it is to be observed, that, while he repressed those feelings of the multitude which arose from false expectations concerning the Messiah, it was necessary for him, at the same time, to give the most decisive proofs of his divine authority. As he but seldom visited this part of the country, we may suppose that it was his purpose to perform a miracle so astonishing and so public that it would make a deep impression, and that the knowledge of it would be spread everywhere round about. Under this aspect the miracle resembles that of the cure of the *dæmoni*acs, related in the eighth chapter of Matthew, which was so remarkable in its circumstances, and which was likewise performed on the eastern shore of the lake.*

The immediate excitement of the multitude produced by supplying them miraculously with food could be, and was, easily repressed. Their feelings toward Jesus were chilled, and their erroneous expectations were in a great measure destroyed, by his subsequent conduct in repelling their offers of allegiance, and by his leaving them during the night. His discourse the next day in the synagogue of Capernaum was adapted to the same end, and produced its intended effect; for after its delivery many of his disciples fell off and continued no longer with him.

* Jesus seems never to have passed beyond the mountains east of the lake.

It is, perhaps, some confirmation of the reasons assigned for our Lord's withdrawing himself at this time, that he seems to have been, subsequently, much less in that part of Galilee (Lower Galilee) in which most of his ministry had before been spent. The feeding of the five thousand occurred about the time of the Passover. After returning to Capernaum, he went to the neighborhood of Tyre and Sidon (Matthew xv. 21; Mark vii. 24), about forty or fifty miles from Capernaum, where, according to Mark, he wished that his presence should not be publicly known. Thence he returned through the Decapolis, on the eastern side of the lake of Galilee, to a mountain near the lake, where he abode, apparently not entering any town, and where also, according to Mark, he wished to be in retirement for a time. (Matthew xv. 29; Mark vii. 31, 36.) But here, again, a multitude collected, and he again provided a miraculous supply of food. Soon after, (immediately after, Mark says,) he crossed to the western side of the lake (Matthew xv. 39; Mark viii. 10, 22), but it does not appear that he remained there long. He went thence to the neighborhood of Cæsarea Philippi (Matthew xvi. 13; Mark viii. 27), about twenty or more miles north of the head of the lake, and not improbably remained in the mountainous country north of the lake during the extreme heat of summer, by which his ministry must have been more or less suspended. Then he returned to Capernaum (Matthew xvii. 22–24; Mark ix. 30, 33), which he appears soon to have left for the last time (Matthew xix. 1; Mark x. 1; Luke ix. 51).

14. “And when Jesus came forth, he saw a great multitude, and he had compassion for them.”

From the accounts of Matthew and Mark it might seem, at

first sight, as if our Lord, on leaving the boat, found a great body of men collected, and that before the end of the same day he miraculously supplied them with food. But, in the very in-artificial style of narration that belongs to the Evangelists, events are sometimes, apparently, brought into much closer connection than that which actually existed between them. One or more days probably intervened, and perhaps a considerable space of time, between our Lord's arrival on the eastern shore of the lake and his feeding the five thousand. John (vi. 1, 3) says that he crossed the lake and went up a mountain where he remained with his disciples. Matthew says that "he withdrew to a solitary place apart," and Mark implies the same. It is his coming down from this mountain (see John vi. 16), this solitary place, that Matthew and Mark refer to when they speak of his "coming forth."

It is not probable that five thousand men, besides women and children, would have collected in a few hours on the eastern shore of the lake, which from its mountainous and rugged character could not have been thickly peopled; nor, considering the usages of travellers in those times, is it to be supposed that the generality of such a multitude would have left their homes without a sufficient supply of food to prevent them from suffering during a single day's absence. When our Lord afterward miraculously fed the four thousand, they had been with him for three days. (Matthew xv. 32; Mark viii. 2.)

20. "And twelve basketfuls of the fragments which remained were collected."

The twelve baskets spoken of appear to have been those of the twelve Apostles, used for carrying provisions and other

stores, after the fashion of their countrymen when absent from home. The Jews seem to have been, in some degree, distinguished by the use of such baskets. It is twice referred to by Juvenal when speaking of the Jews at Rome. He says (Sat. iii. 13) :

“Nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur
Judæis, quorum cophinus fœnumque supellex.”

“Now the grove and shrines of the sacred fountain are let to Jews, whose whole furniture is a basket and some hay.” See also Sat. vi. 542.

22 - 33. (Account of Jesus's walking on the lake.)

There is nothing in Luke corresponding to what follows, from verse 22 to ch. xvi. 13.

Observe that the account of Peter's desire of walking on the water is not found in Mark or John.

28. “Then Peter said to him, Master, if it be thou, bid me come to thee on the water.”

“If it be thou,” is equivalent in sense to “since it is you.” But the former turn of expression answers better to the excited state of mind in which Peter must have been.

XV. 1. “After this, the teachers of the Law and Pharisees from Jerusalem came to Jesus.”

These teachers of the Law and Pharisees appear to have come from Jerusalem, which was the residence of the most eminent of their class, for the purpose of finding some cavil or

accusation against Christ, that they might counteract his influence, or procure his destruction.

The conversation related in the first twenty verses of this chapter probably occurred at Capernaum. See Mark vii. 17.

2. “Why do your disciples do contrary to the tradition of the elders? for they do not wash their hands when they eat.”

This was a subject about which those Jews who affected a religious character appear to have been particularly scrupulous and superstitious. In the Talmud there are many extravagant declarations concerning the guilt of eating with unwashed hands. It is said, for example, “Whoever despises the washing of hands shall be rooted out of the world.”

4. “*Let him who reviles father or mother be put to death.*”

These words are taken from Exodus xxi. 17, where they are translated in the Common Version, “He that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death.”

If we believe that this command was not given by God to the Jewish nation in particular, and also, that it is not, like that first mentioned, “Honor thy father and thy mother,” a universal law of God, there are two modes in which we may explain the passage before us.

Our Lord, in adducing the words, may have reasoned with the Jews on their own belief, since the Jews regarded the command in question as having proceeded from God. Or, in the process of oral tradition, by which his discourses were for some time preserved, this quotation from the Old Testament may

have been introduced into the report of it, as appearing to illustrate and strengthen the argument. It seems, however, in fact, to have but little bearing upon it, and the train of thought is complete, and appears more closely connected and more forcible, if it be omitted. It perhaps deserves observation, likewise, that in both Matthew and Mark our Lord is represented as speaking of "the command of God" in the singular number, not of "commands" in the plural; which may seem to indicate, that, in reporting his discourse, the second command alleged was regarded as not having been quoted by him, but only as adduced by the reporter on account of its supposed correspondence with that which he did quote.

5. "But you teach, If a man say to his father or mother, Whatever I have which might benefit you is as a gift to God, he shall then not honor his father or mother."

I have given the sense without adhering to the words of the original. Verbally rendered, the passage would stand thus: "But you say, *Whoever may tell his father or his mother, Whatever I have which might benefit you is a gift; —* and he shall not honor his father or his mother." I conceive that the words in Italics are the first words of the traditionary law to which Jesus referred, and that he considered the quotation of these first words as sufficient to recall the whole law to the minds of his hearers. This mode of citing is common at the present day, except that the idiom of modern languages requires the addition of "&c." *

* The coincidence of Matthew and Mark (vii. 10) in their embarrassing construction of the words of Christ, and, at the same time,

In this passage our Saviour refers to a mode of laying an obligation upon themselves, which was common among the Jews, by the use of the word *Corban*, which is found in Mark, or some one regarded as equivalent, as *Conam*. The proper use of these words was to denote that something was offered or vowed to God; but they were employed also much more loosely, to signify that the person making the vow would act generally, or in some particular, in reference to the thing spoken of, as if it were consecrated to God, or to sacred uses. Thus, in the instance before us, the meaning of the words of the son who refuses support to his father is not, My property is devoted to God; but, I take a vow upon myself that you shall derive no more benefit from my property than if it were devoted to God.

In the Talmud there is much discussion of the nature and obligation of vows of this kind, and many examples of them are adduced; as, for instance, "May all that by which I might benefit my wife be *Conam*," that is, as a thing vowed to God. The question is treated, what vows of this sort made by a woman can be set aside by her husband; and it is decided, that, if she binds herself to do nothing for the benefit of her own or her husband's father, her husband cannot release her from the obligation. A story is told of a son who had bound himself not to assist his father, but, on the marriage of his daughter, directed his son-in-law to invite him to the marriage-feast, and for this purpose gave up to one of his friends, for the time, his property in the room and the entertainment, upon condition of his

their want of verbal agreement, are remarkable. So likewise in the quotation, verse 9 (Mark vii. 7), where they differ from both the Hebrew and the Septuagint.

father's being invited. But his conduct is condemned. The property, it is decided, should have been given up without reserve and unconditionally. There is also another particular mention of the vow against a father spoken of by our Saviour. The question, it appears, was debated by the Rabbis, whether a person could be absolved from it merely on the ground of the honor due to a parent, and it was finally decided that he might be. The power of absolving from this and other vows was supposed to be in the hands of the Rabbis. See Pocock's Works, I. 274, seqq., and Lightfoot, Wetstein, and Gill on this passage. Josephus (De Bell. Jud. Lib. II. c. 9. § 4) calls the sacred treasure *Corban*.

11. “Not that which enters the mouth pollutes a man, but what proceeds from the mouth.”

Δι' οὗ [τοῦ στόματος] γίνεται θνητῶν μὲν, ὡς ἔφη Πλάτων, εἴσοδος, ἔξοδος δ' ἀφθάρτων. Ἐπεισέρχεται μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ σιτία καὶ ποτά, φθαρτοῦ σώματος φθαρταὶ τροφαί· λόγοι δ' ἐξίσσιν, ἀθάνατου ψυχῆς ἀθάνατοι νόμοι, δι' ὧν ὁ λογικὸς βίος κυβερνᾶται. [“Through the mouth, as Plato says, mortal things enter, but imperishable things proceed from it. For food and drink enter it, perishable nutriment of the perishable body; but words proceed from it, immortal laws of the immortal soul, by which the rational life is governed.”] — Philo, De Mundi Opificio. Opp. I. 29.

15. “Then Peter said to him, Explain to us that dark saying.”

The “dark saying” meant by Peter is the declaration of Jesus given in the eleventh verse, — “Not that which enters the mouth pollutes a man,” &c.; — which was the speech by

which the Pharisees were scandalized. Being directly contrary to the Levitical law concerning clean and unclean food, it was also a “dark saying” to the Apostles. See *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. pp. clxxiv – clxxvi.

21 – 28. (Our Saviour’s treatment of the Canaanitish woman who besought him to cure her daughter.)

“It is to be recollected, that the disciples of our Saviour at this time shared in the common narrow prejudices of the Jews in respect to other nations. They would have been dissatisfied, their feelings would have revolted, if their Master, the Jewish Messiah, had at once performed a miracle for the benefit of a Heathen. By his delay, by suffering her to importune him without an answer, their natural feelings of humanity were left to operate in her favor. They themselves at last take her part, and ask him to ‘send her away satisfied’; for their words may express this meaning; and that this was in fact their meaning appears from the reply of Christ. By what he further said, he gave her an opportunity of showing herself, not merely an object of compassion, but of approbation. He thus afforded her a new source of gratification, and the incident at the same time tended still further to enlarge the feelings of his disciples. The interest which they took in her case, and the praise of her which their Master expressed, must have served to break down their illiberal prejudices. It is to be observed, likewise, that the words of Christ have a different effect in the original from what they have as rendered in the Common Version, — ‘It is not meet to take the children’s bread, and to cast it to dogs.’ The last word, in the original, is a diminutive, —

one of that class of diminutives which is commonly used in expressions of familiarity or endearment. It properly denotes those little dogs which were kept as playthings. It is evident what a different air is given to the whole speech by this circumstance." — *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, pp. 279 – 281.

Mark (ch. vii. 24 – 30) differs much from Matthew in his mode of relating this narrative.

24. "I am sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

My personal ministry must be confined to the Jews; for so it was designed to be. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

27. "And she said, Ah, Sir! even the little dogs eat the crumbs which fall from their master's table."

Nai, "particula obsecrantis." See Kuinoel. *Kai yáp* refers to the implied request, and cannot be expressed in English. The sense is, "Master, I entreat you, for even the little dogs," &c.

39. "Then he sent away the multitude, and going on board the boat, went to the country near Magdala."

Magdala is nowhere else mentioned in the Gospels, nor does the name occur in Josephus; but the Jerusalem Talmud seems to afford sufficient means for determining its site. From this it appears that it was very near Tiberias, being not more than a Sabbath-day's journey (that is, less than a mile) from the

warm baths which adjoined that city on the south.* As the Jerusalem Talmud was compiled at Tiberias, there seems no reason to doubt this information.

There is a village called el-Mejdel now standing at the southern extremity of the plain of Gennesaret. This, from the resemblance of its name, has been supposed by some to mark the site of the ancient Magdala. But as it is about four miles north of the warm baths, which could be reached from it only by passing through or round Tiberias, it could not have been the Magdala of the Talmudists, which, in all probability, was that referred to by Matthew. The name "el-Mejdel" means "the Fortress," and was, as a common name, given to many different places. It was probably given long after the time of the Evangelists to the place that now bears it on the lake of Galilee, where there were in Pococke's time "considerable remains of a very indifferent castle." (Pococke's Description of the East, II. 71.) The Magdala of the Gospels, I suppose, derived its name from a more ancient fortress. Lightfoot has confounded the warm baths in or near Tiberias with those near Gadara on the eastern side of the lake. (See Reland, *Palæstina*, I. 302.) The latter are described by Irby and Mangles pp. 90, 91.

XVI. 1-4. (Answer of Jesus to the Pharisees and Sadducees, who asked him to show them a sign from heaven.)

See the notes on John vi. 30 ; Luke xii. 54-59 ; Matthew xii. 38, and 39, 40.

* Lightfoot, *Opp.* II. 226, 413. I refer to his quotations, which must be compared together, and not to his opinions. See also Wetstein.

7. “And they talked among themselves of what they should do, as they had brought no bread.”

More literally, “And they talked among themselves, saying, We took no bread.” The Greek word *οὐτι*, as often in similar cases, does not here admit of translation.

13, 14. “Jesus asked his disciples, Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am? And they answered, Some say, John the Baptist; others, Elijah; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the Prophets.”

“In the Oriental languages, the term ‘son of man’ was used simply as equivalent to ‘man.’ Of this, as every one knows, there are many examples in the Old and New Testament. In the Syriac version of the New Testament, this periphrasis not unfrequently occurs where only the word *ἄνθρωπος*, ‘man,’ is used in the original. In this, which is, I conceive, the only sense of the term, it was used by Christ concerning himself. ‘The Son of Man’ means nothing more than ‘the Man.’ Why he so designated himself has not, I think, been satisfactorily explained. It may be accounted for by the state of things which has been already referred to.* The coming of the Messiah was a dangerous topic of discourse. He would, consequently, be designated by ambiguous titles; and such language would naturally be used as, ‘When THE MAN [the Son of Man] comes’; ‘THE MAN will deliver us.’ Hence this term, I imagine, came to signify the Messiah, but somewhat ambiguously.

* See Statement of Reasons, p. 177.

The uncertainty of its application might be increased, when our Saviour entered on his ministry; for he, simply as an individual exciting such strong and general interest and curiosity by his miracles and doctrine, would, we may easily suppose, be designated as ‘the Man.’* A term which thus strongly intimated, but did not directly express, his claim to be that great minister of God whom the Jews had been expecting, was well suited to the circumstances in which he was placed; and was, in consequence, adopted by him as a title appropriate to himself.” — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 196, 197.

So in the present case: “Who do men say that I, the Man on whom the eyes of the whole Jewish nation are fixed, am?” — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

“Some say, John the Baptist.” These words have been understood literally, as if they were a declaration that some believed that our Lord was John the Baptist reappearing on earth, or that the soul of John had transmigrated into him at his birth. I suppose, as I have before explained, (see the note on ch. xiv. 1–12,) that the individuals referred to did not entertain either belief, but only meant that Jesus was, figuratively speaking, another John the Baptist.

As our Lord and John were contemporaries, and were both so conspicuous, it is very improbable that any who had heard the fame of both were so ignorant as not to know that they were contemporaries, or that Jesus had become conspicuous before the death of John. I suppose, therefore, that the

* We may observe an analogous use of language in the First Epistle of John, in which Christ is designated simply by the pronoun ‘He,’ without any previous mention of his name to which the pronoun can refer. See 1 John ii. 12; iii. 5, 7, 16.”

meaning of the Apostles was: Some think you are another John the Baptist, another teacher from God like him, without any more settled opinion respecting your character; while others think that you are Elijah, or Jeremiah, or some other of the old Prophets reappearing on earth.

The brief and in itself equivocal language of their reply “Some say, John the Baptist,” is to be accounted for by the consideration, that, under the circumstances of the case, there could be no doubt as to its meaning, and that neither the Apostles who spoke, nor the Evangelists who recorded their language, had in mind readers of a distant age, who from inattention to those circumstances might understand it literally.

“Others, Elijah.” See the note on ch. xi. 10.

“Others, Jeremiah.” The Jews had a tradition that, before the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, the tabernacle, the ark of the covenant, and the altar of incense had been hidden by Jeremiah in a cave of Mount Nebo, where they were to remain concealed till the time of the Messiah. Jeremiah, they believed, would then reappear to discover them. See 2 Maccabees ii. 1–8, and Wetstein’s note on the present passage. — This paragraph is from *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

16. “You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God.”

“The living God” is the true God, as distinguished from idols.

17. “This has not been made known to you by flesh and blood, but by my Father in heaven.”

‘Flesh and blood’ is a common Hebraism to denote ‘man.’

The meaning of Jesus was this : You have not learned this truth from men. You have not been influenced by their wrong opinions, their prejudices, or bad passions ; but your mind has been open to the evidence which God has presented to you. It is God who has taught you my true character.

18. “ You are, as I have named you, a Rock, and on this rock will I build my church ; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.”

Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, κ. τ. λ. The name “ Peter ” in Greek signifies “ a rock ” ; but the allusion in these words to the name of the Apostle cannot be preserved in a translation. Jesus, speaking in the Aramæan dialect, used the same word (ܠܫܢܐ, *Kepha*, *Cephas*) in both clauses, and so also did Matthew, who wrote in the same dialect. But his translator and the other Evangelists have in the second clause substituted *πέτρα* for *πέτρος*, they being familiar with the former word, but not with the latter, in the sense of *rock*. In this sense *πέτρος* nowhere occurs in the New Testament, but *πέτρα* is often used. As a name for the Apostle, however, *Πέτρος* in the masculine form was alone suitable. See John i. 42.

“ The gates of Hades,” or the gates of death. — Among the ancients, both Gentiles and Jews, Hades, or the place of the dead, was conceived of as a vast subterranean receptacle, closed by gates which admitted of no escape. They spoke of death under the figure of passing those gates. [See Isaiah xxxviii. 10 ; Job xxxviii. 17 ; Psalm ix. 13 ; cvii. 18 ; — and Wetstein’s note on this passage.] The meaning therefore is, that the Church, the community of Christians, shall never be destroyed.

The gates of Hades shall never prevail against it by closing upon it and confining it.

19. “And I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and what you shall forbid on earth will be forbidden in heaven, and what you shall permit on earth will be permitted in heaven.”

The Jews familiarly used the terms “to bind” and “to loose” metaphorically, in the sense of “to forbid” and “to permit.” See Wetstein’s note. They used them concerning the teachers of their Law, who were supposed capable of explaining its requirements, what it forbade and what it permitted. When Jesus says, “I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven,” his meaning is, I will appoint you a minister of my religion, to make known to men the terms on which they may enter the kingdom of Heaven. What follows is an amplification of this idea:—I will appoint you a teacher and expositor of my religion, to declare to men its requirements, what it forbids and permits; and be assured that what is thus forbidden and permitted by you is forbidden and permitted by God. It is of the authority of Peter as a minister of his religion that Jesus speaks, and not of any power to be exercised according to his discretion as an individual.

In a similar manner we are to understand the passage, ch. xviii. 18, in which the same declaration is extended to all the Apostles; and also the corresponding passage in John xx. 23, where the words are, “Whosoever sins you may remit are remitted, and whosoever sins you may not remit are not remitted”; that is, the sins of men will be remitted or not remitted, according as they receive or reject the conditions of their remission, which you, as ministers of my religion, will announce.

The figurative mode of expression which appears in these passages is common throughout the New Testament. Christianity is personified and embodied in its Founder and his ministers. Its divine authority, its laws, its sanctions, the distinctions which these create among men, and its effects generally, are metaphorically represented as resulting from their personal authority, or ascribed to their immediate agency. In its simplest form this figure is obvious, and presents no difficulty; as when Jesus says, "Come to *me*, all you who are laboring under heavy burdens, and *I* will give you rest." But the bold metaphorical style of the East admitted of a use of it, which, when transferred into our own language, requires explanation.

See also, on this subject, Appendix, Note E.

24 "Let him who would be my follower renounce himself, and come after me, bearing his cross"

"The Common Version, in rendering 'deny himself,' expresses nothing like the force of the original, which implies a total putting off of all selfish affections. We are familiar with the figure of 'taking up the cross,' and the figurative meaning of these words is, for the most part, the only one which presents itself to our minds. We can hardly feel the impression which it must have made upon those to whom the horrible torture of crucifixion, as inflicted upon the most wretched outcasts of society, was not an uncommon spectacle. He who was to suffer this dreadful death was compelled to bear his cross to the place of execution. It is to this that Christ alludes. No form of words could represent with more fearful distinctness, that they were to prepare themselves for torture and death." — *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, pp. 271, 272.

26. “And what is there that a man will not give to purchase his life?”

ἡ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος, κ. τ. λ. The meaning, fully expressed, is, Can you say what a man will give, how much he will give? Can you fix the sum? The sense, therefore, of the whole passage is expressed in English by rendering, “And what will a man *not* give to purchase his life?” Others explain τί δώσει as meaning, “What has he to give?” But the idea intended to be expressed is the value put upon life, not the inability of a man to retain his life.

27, 28. “The Son of Man is coming in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then will he render to every one according to his deeds. I tell you in truth, There are some here present who will not taste of death, before they see the Son of Man entering on his reign.”

The meaning of the first part of this passage is, The Son of Man will come to reign, the kingdom of Heaven will be gloriously established, through the providence and power of God. By the coming of the Son of Man to reign, or by the establishment of the kingdom of Heaven, is meant the establishment of Christianity.

He is coming “with his angels.” This figure is derived from the conception of the Jews, that angels were the ministers by whom God executed his will.

“He will render to every one according to his deeds.” These words are a continuation of the figure by which Jesus is represented as a king. The literal sense is, that every one will

be judged by the laws he has promulgated,—the laws of his kingdom, the rules of Christianity,—and the condition of every one will be determined by the conformity of his conduct to them.

The purport of the concluding declaration is, that this kingdom, or Christianity, would be established in the world during the lifetime of some then present.

See also, on these verses, Appendix, Note E, pp. 524, 525.

XVII. 1–8. (The Transfiguration.)

The design of this miracle appears to have been,—

1. By a scene which should make the most powerful impression on the senses and the imagination,—a “sign from heaven” such as the Pharisees had demanded,—to produce in the minds of the three leading Apostles who were present with Jesus the strongest conviction of his divine mission, and to prepare them, as far as possible, for the overwhelming disappointment of their cherished hopes in his approaching death.

2. To show them that a close relation existed between himself and those earlier messengers of God whom they held in peculiar reverence, Moses, the founder, and Elijah, the restorer of their ancient religion, who had prepared the way for him who “came not to annul the Law or the Prophets, but to perfect.”

3. To give the disciples direct and palpable evidence of the reality of a future life.—*MS. Notes of Lectures.*

11. “Jesus answered them, ‘Elijah is coming to reform all things!’”

The meaning is, They say, indeed, that Elijah is first coming. The feeling meant to be expressed by Jesus would be conveyed

by the words, Say they so, that Elijah is coming? The assertion is not made in his own person. He repeats the language which the teachers of the Law were accustomed to use.* To the belief that Jesus was the Messiah, they had probably objected, what, as we have seen, was regarded as a difficulty by the disciples themselves, that Elijah had not preceded him to prepare the nation for his reception. See note on ch. xi. 10.

Jesus could not intend that Elijah, or (to drop the figure) John, regarded as possessing the office which had been ascribed to Elijah, was to come and reform all things, considering that John effected no such general reformation; but, on the contrary, his divine mission had not been acknowledged by the leading men of the nation, and he himself had been calumniated (Matthew xi. 18) and put to death.

14-21. (The cure of the dæmoniac boy by Jesus.)

For a comparison of this passage with the parallel accounts of Mark and Luke, showing that no one of the Evangelists copied either of the other two, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxxix, seqq.

20. "If you should say to this mountain, Remove from this place to that, it would remove."

Verbally, "You will say and it will remove." We have here an instance of the Hebraistic construction remarked upon in the note on ch. vii. 22, 23.

* So Kuinoel: "Per ironiam laudat h. l. Jesus ipsa doctorum Judaicorum verba." Compare ch. xv. 26.

21. "But it is only through prayer and fasting that this race can be expelled."

By "this race" is not meant, I conceive, any particular kind of dæmons, but dæmons generally. By "prayer and fasting" are intended the exercises of piety. The meaning of Jesus was, that the power of miraculously curing those diseases which were ascribed to dæmons would be granted only to those accustomed to recognize their dependence upon God.

24-27. (The payment of the tribute-money by Jesus.)

The half-shekel was the capitation-tax for the service of the temple, and consequently was regarded as due to God. The object of the words of Jesus was to impress the minds of his disciples in a striking manner with the truth, that he and they were sons of God. It was necessary for him continually to direct their thoughts to the fact of his and their extraordinary relation to God, and the peculiarity in his manner of doing it upon this occasion would tend to make a deeper impression on their minds than a simple declaration of the truth might have done.

XVIII. 1-35. (Jesus rebukes the rivalry among his disciples.)

According to Mark and Luke, the Apostles had been disputing on the road, before arriving at Capernaum, as to who should hereafter hold the highest rank in the kingdom of Heaven, that is, in the temporal kingdom which, in common with their countrymen, they supposed would be established by the Messiah. There was probably a rivalry between Peter on

the one part and James and John on the other. These three Apostles had been particularly distinguished by their Master. They, together with Andrew, the brother of Peter, had probably been the first, or among the first, who joined themselves to Jesus as his daily companions. See Matthew iv. 18-22; John i. 35-42. They, with Andrew, are first named in the lists of the Apostles. They alone were permitted by Jesus to accompany him when he entered the house of the ruler of the synagogue to restore life to his daughter. (Mark v. 37; Luke viii. 51.) They had lately received the high distinction of being selected to witness his transfiguration. Though they were not at liberty during his ministry to communicate what they had then seen and heard, yet the other Apostles knew that they had been long apart with their Master, and they themselves, not improbably, had given intimations that they were the sole depositaries of a great secret. Peter commonly appears as taking the lead among the Apostles,—as the individual most ready to speak and act. To him individually our Lord had very lately declared, that he was the rock on which he would build his Church; and Peter alone he had just associated with himself in the payment of the half-shekel for the temple. But John, on the other hand, was known as the disciple whom Jesus loved. He and his brother had been particularly distinguished by their Master, together with Peter; and it appears from the request which they preferred after this time, that they thought they had a good claim to the highest places in his kingdom,—to sit, one on his right hand, and the other on his left (ch. xx. 20-23). Whether there were any other competitors for the highest place in the kingdom of the Messiah, we cannot say; but if there were, as we suppose, three kinsmen of Jesus among his Apostles, it is not improbable.

It seems likely that the immediate occasion of the discussion among the Apostles at this time was an incident which, according to Mark and Luke, was thus referred to by John in the course of the conversation: "Master, we saw one casting out demons in your name, and we forbade him, because he is not of our company." (Luke ix. 49; Mark ix. 38.) From the manner in which John introduces the mention of this fact, we may infer that he intended to give an account of the origin of the dispute, which, consequently, appears to have been the assumption of authority on his part; his doing what, if Peter regarded it as proper to be done at all, he would probably think should have been done by himself. But the feelings which had entered into the controversy that took place on the road must have been excited anew, immediately after the arrival at Capernaum, by the special manner in which Peter was distinguished in being alone associated with his Master in the miraculous provision made for the payment of the contribution for the temple.

But the personal ambition and worldly feelings of the Apostles were not merely founded upon a great error; they were wholly inconsistent with the character required in them as followers of Christ, and ministers of his religion. The indulgence of their ambitious hopes would have turned away their thoughts and feelings from their proper duties, and would have led to such bitter disappointment as could hardly have failed to destroy their attachment to his cause, the character of which they would have so misapprehended, and to produce apostasy. In a selfish contention for the favor of their Master, they would have lost much of their respect for him, and of their regard for each other. It would have destroyed that concert among themselves so important to the purposes of their mission, and

which he was so solicitous to establish. Rivalship would have produced mutual jealousy, envy, and ill-will; and the assumption of worldly superiority on the part of those who thought they had the highest claims would tend to alienate and repel those who were regarded as inferiors, and who might feel themselves inferior, not in Christian virtues, but in intellect and power of action.

The object, therefore, of this discourse of our Saviour was, to teach his Apostles humility, and the necessity of an entire change in their feelings and purposes (vv. 2-4); — to make them understand how criminal it was to be the cause of sin in others, or to give them any disgust to his religion, or in any way to impede their moral improvement, all which would be the probable consequences of their contending with one another about superiority, or of their exercising an improper authority over those not of their body (vv. 5-9); — to prevent them from despising any of his followers, and to lead them to comprehend the worth of every convert to religion and goodness (vv. 10-14); — and, as their contentions with one another had probably been the cause of mutual offence, to teach them how to conduct themselves towards an offending brother (vv. 15-17).

“The words which follow are not particularly connected with these directions, but generally with the whole discourse. Our Saviour, having attempted to repress all improper pride and ambition in his disciples, teaches them their real dignity and authority as ministers of his religion. As such they were ministers of God to declare what He forbade and what He commanded. The precepts and directions given by them as announcing his will would be ratified in heaven. The jealousies and dissensions among the Apostles appear to have arisen in part from what our Saviour had formerly said to Peter: ‘What

you shall forbid on earth will be forbidden in heaven, and what you shall permit on earth will be permitted in heaven.' (Matthew xvi. 19.) In the present discourse, in order to do away any claim of superiority which Peter might have founded on this address, and to prevent it from being a ground of dissension, Christ repeats the same words, and extends the declaration to all his Apostles. He then speaks further of their interest with God as ministers of his religion. But he connects this with a new recommendation of concord and unity. As ministers of his religion, they were to be united in their purposes, wishes, and prayers; and they might then be secure of God's peculiar assistance and favor. What they should supplicate in common, as servants of Christ, with such feelings as he required, would be granted by God. It would be as if Christ himself were praying with them.*

“When we understand the occasion and bearing of the discourse, we perceive, at once, the coincidence in what is related of Peter. ‘Then Peter came to him and said, Master, if my brother sin against me, how often shall I forgive him?’ Peter, it is probable, had been particularly exasperated in the controversy concerning pre-eminence; and nothing, in his consequent state of feeling, could be more natural than this question.” — *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, pp. 209 – 211.

For further remarks on this passage, see the work just quoted, p. 204, seqq.

10. “Their angels in heaven continually behold the face of my Father in heaven.”

This language is figurative, founded on the notion of the

* See Statement of Reasons, pp. 159, 160.

Jews that the providence of God was administered by angels, and that a guardian angel was assigned to every individual. There is also an allusion to the customary seclusion of Oriental monarchs, who admitted into their presence only their particular favorites. (See 2 Kings xxv. 19; Esther i. 14; Jeremiah lii. 25, in the Hebrew.) — The meaning is, My humblest disciples enjoy the favor of God. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

17. “Let him be to you as a heathen and a tax-gatherer.”

The sense is, If he persist in his fault, let him no longer be considered as my disciple; for his temper is such as no disciple of mine should indulge. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

XIX. 1. “After Jesus had finished this discourse, he removed from Galilee, and went beyond the Jordan to the borders of Judæa.”

Our Lord went into Peræa, that is, the part of Palestine lying to the east of Samaria, and separated from it by the Jordan. The name Judæa is here to be understood in its more extensive sense, as equivalent to Palestine. The name Peræa is not used in the New Testament. See Reland, *Palæstina*, I. 32, seqq. The expression ἡ Ἰουδαία πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου is, as Reland remarks, used by Josephus in one instance to denote Peræa. (*Antiq. Jud. Lib. XII. c. 4. § 11.*)

3–9. (Answer of Jesus to the question of the Pharisees concerning divorce.)

“In the time of our Saviour, the majority of the Jews inferred, as they were authorized to do, from the Levitical Law,

that a man might divorce his wife for any cause of offence whatever.* The Pharisees, who had, doubtless, heard something of his teaching respecting this subject, were desirous that it should be brought out in still more open opposition to the Law, that it might afford them an opportunity to excite against him the prejudices of the multitude. They, accordingly, came to question him on the subject, and made their inquiry with a show of deference."

"Our Saviour," in answer, "directly opposes his teaching to the Levitical Law; not, it should be observed, on the ground that that Law had proceeded from God, but that he was commissioned to revoke it; on the contrary, he declares the Law itself, in the particular in question, essentially bad, and contrary to the will of God. In the words, 'Moses, on account of your perversity, allowed you to put away your wives,' we are to consider the *essential* idea, which is, that the law had its occasion in the perversity of the Jews. The expression, 'Moses allowed,' is merely an adaptation of his language to the popular belief, concerning which any direct controversy would have defeated the purpose he had in view. But, while using this expression, Jesus at the same time affords decisive ground for concluding the belief to be erroneous. If the law respecting divorce proceeded from Moses, it proceeded from God. But a law cannot have proceeded from God which is contrary to the will of God, and accommodated to human perversity, — a law that counteracts the moral civilization of men, and indulges them in selfishness, sensuality, and domestic tyranny. It is to be recollected, that the code which contained this law likewise presented a broad contrast to Christianity in sanctioning polyg-

* See the note on Matthew v. 31, 32.

amy and concubinage. How different the teaching of Jesus was from the notions which the Jews had derived from the Levitical Law, and the practice which they had founded upon it, appears from the remark of his own disciples, after his conversation with the Pharisees: 'If such is the case of a man with his wife, it is better not to marry.' " — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. pp. clxxvii. — clxxix.

12. "And there are others who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of Heaven," &c.

This is to be understood figuratively, meaning only that some have chosen celibacy for the sake of devoting themselves to the furtherance of Christianity.

"Let him who is able to abstain from marriage, abstain."

The meaning is, In the present state of things, it is better for my disciples not to marry; because thus they may devote themselves with the fewest obstacles to the promulgation of my religion. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

16 – 22. "And lo! one came to him and said, Good teacher, what good thing shall I do to have eternal life? And he said to him," &c.

The young man mentioned in this account came to Jesus, as we may infer, with the false sentiment, common to the Jews of his time, and corresponding to what has always been found among men, that the favor of God might be secured by some observance unconnected with moral goodness. He appears to have expected that Jesus would enjoin, for instance, some unusual austerity, some long-continued exercise of fasting and

prayer, or some peculiar vow, or some extraordinary almsgiving, or some large gift to the treasury of the temple, or some other definite act or course of conduct of a like character, by the performance of which he might assure himself of eternal life. Looking upon Jesus as a religious reformer, he supposed him ready to point out a new mode of obtaining God's favor. In opposition to this false sentiment, Jesus gave him to understand, that no teacher could lay down rules for obtaining eternal life other than the laws of God; that to give such rules no other teacher was *good* but God (for this is here the sense of the word *good*); that what God required was obedience to the universal laws of religion and morality, such as are contained in the Ten Commandments; and that the simple and only way by which he might enter into life was by performing his duties of universal obligation, so far as he comprehended them.

The answer of the young man, implying that he had discharged all his obligations from his youth upward, shows that he had but an imperfect notion of their nature and extent. From what follows, it appears that he was not prepared for the sacrifices now required of him. It had become his duty to profess himself a disciple of Christ, and, giving up all regard to worldly interests, to devote himself to the cause of his religion. This new duty Jesus announced to him, and it is particularly to be observed, that, in doing so, he did not impose upon him any peculiar and arbitrary trial of virtue. He required nothing of the young man of a different nature from what he required of all his followers. They were all, according to their various characters and circumstances, either at once to give up their interest in worldly concerns, or to be prepared to make this sacrifice, should occasion require it. Thus Peter says, "Lo! we have left all to become your followers"; and in Luke (xii.

33) Jesus says generally to his *disciples* (that is, as I conceive, to his immediate followers, who were qualified to become teachers of his religion) what he here says particularly to the young man: "Sell what you possess and give it to the poor." Compare also Luke xiv. 33.

24. "It is easier for a camel to pass through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God."

The virtues at this time particularly required in the followers of Jesus, such as the renunciation of the world and a readiness to encounter contempt, obloquy, and hatred, were much more difficult to be practised by the rich than by the poor. — The figure of a camel passing through a needle's eye was of a kind familiar to the Jews. The same figure, except that an elephant is substituted for a camel, is found in the Talmud and other Rabbinical works. It denotes not merely what is impossible, but also, hyperbolically, what is very difficult. See Buxtorf's *Lexicon Talmudicum*, col. 1722.

25. "His disciples, when they heard this, were altogether confounded, and said, Who then can be saved?"

"Their thoughts still dwelt upon an earthly kingdom; and could this hold out no rewards to tempt men to become his followers? Was the whole course of his disciples through life to be one of privation, labor, and suffering? 'Who then,' they ask, 'can be saved?' That is, How are you to collect followers? How is your kingdom to be established? — It is to this indirect meaning of the question, I conceive, that the reply of

Christ is directed. Men would be saved, his religion would be established, not by human means, but by displays of the power of God." — *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, p. 216.

27 — XX. 16. (Promises of Jesus to his disciples, followed by the parable of the laborers in a vineyard.)

"Peter then, with feelings similar to those which have been before described, brings forward the claims of the Apostles: 'Lo! we have left all to become your followers. What then will be our reward?' Our Saviour answers him in strong, metaphorical language, borrowing the figure which he uses from the thoughts which possessed their minds. 'And Jesus said to them, I tell you in truth, that you, my followers, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, shall also sit on twelve thrones, ruling [*literally*, judging] the twelve tribes of Israel.'* It was thus that he not unfrequently adopted the language in which his hearers might express their ideas, and conformed it to the expression of his own; in this manner facilitating the reception of the latter by their minds. The expectations of his Apostles would not be literally gratified, but they would be gratified in a much higher sense. When men should be regenerated by his religion, when his spiritual kingdom should be established, they, his Apostles,

* It having been in ancient times common in the East for kings to act as judges, the whole exercise of regal authority was sometimes denoted by the word *judging*, as it is metaphorically in the present passage. 'The twelve tribes of Israel' is a figurative expression for the whole people of God."

would be regarded as next to him in authority and dignity. For all their sacrifices, he proceeds to say, they should receive a hundred fold, and should inherit eternal life.

“But the parable which follows, of the laborers in a vineyard, is intended to correct any false hopes, improper confidence, or undue estimation of themselves, which these promises might otherwise have excited in the Apostles. They might naturally think that the mere circumstance of their early adherence to our Saviour, their being his first, or among his first, followers, would entitle them to peculiar rewards. This might reasonably be expected by the followers of an earthly leader. But the object of this parable was to teach them that the future recompense of men would not be affected by their becoming his followers early or late, if they became such as soon as invited. It would depend only on their moral excellence. In this respect many of those who became converts at a later period might be superior to others who earlier professed themselves his disciples. The last might be first, and the first last.” — *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, pp. 216–218.

We are not to infer from this parable that the rewards of all will be equal. In the interpretation of parables minor circumstances are not to be insisted upon, but the main purpose only is to be regarded. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

XX. 16. “For the invited are many, but the selected are few.”

That is, There are many who profess themselves my disciples, many who are invited and *accept the invitation* (an idea which seems always to be included in the word *κλητός* as used

in the New Testament), but few of these will be selected to receive special rewards. Many of my followers will prove unworthy. Compare ch. xxii. 14. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

31. “And the multitude endeavored to silence them.”

An intimation of the deference with which the multitude at this time regarded Jesus, as some great personage.

XXI. 9. “Hosanna to the Son of David! Hosanna, thou in the highest heavens!”

That is, God bless the Son of David! Thou who dwellest in the highest heavens, bless him! Equivalent to the modern expression, “God save the king.” — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

12, 13. (The expulsion of the traders from the temple.)

The majority of the Jews at Jerusalem regarded Jesus as an enemy to God and religion. His purpose in this bold proceeding appears to have been to impress them with a strong sense of his divine authority, and of his zeal for the pure worship of God. The expulsion of the traders was, at the same time, a severe indirect rebuke of the priests and rulers, by whom these abuses of the temple were sanctioned.

It is not necessary to suppose that our Lord exercised any miraculous power on this occasion. He was accompanied by an excited multitude from Galilee, who venerated him as a prophet or even as the expected Messiah (vv. 9–11), and whose presence would deter the traffickers from any opposition.

The “doves” were sold to the poorer classes, who were per-

mitted by the Levitical Law to use them as a substitute for more expensive sacrifices. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

20. “And his disciples, seeing it, were astonished, and said, How suddenly the fig-tree withered !”

“It may seem, at first view, difficult to account for the emotion of the disciples, after all the other astonishing miracles which they had witnessed. But we may understand it, when we consider the striking visible phenomenon presented, so different from any which Jesus had before effected, its startling suddenness, and the peculiar character of the miracle, unlike his former works of mercy, a symbolical act, a visible parable, as it were, intended to indicate the punishment about to fall upon the great body of the Jews, to whom Jesus had ‘come seeking fruit and found none.’ * ” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxxv.

On the difference between Matthew and Mark in their accounts of this miracle, showing that the latter did not copy from the former, see what follows the passage just quoted.

25. “If we say, From Heaven, he will say, Why then did you not have faith in him ?”

John had declared that Christ had received authority from God, and was a divine teacher far superior to himself. It was in reference to this declaration, that his enemies apprehended that our Saviour would ask them, “Why do you not believe

“* See the parable of the barren fig-tree (Luke xiii. 6 – 9), which is to be considered as explanatory of this miracle.”

what he said?" The argument implied in this appeal to the authority of John would be understood by others as well as by them, and was adapted strongly to affect those who esteemed John to be a prophet; especially when left uncontroverted by the priests and elders. It at the same time silenced them, and prevented all that cavilling discussion of the claims of our Saviour to divine authority, for which they had probably come prepared.

28 – 32. (The parable of the two sons.)

The insertion of this parable by Matthew, who wrote for Jewish readers, and its omission by Mark and Luke, who wrote for Gentiles, is to be remarked.

41. "Some answered him."

Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ. That is, some of the multitude; not the chief priests and elders (v. 23). For a similar looseness of expression in the original, see John viii. 33. Note the discrepancy between Matthew and Mark (xii. 9) and Luke (xx. 15, 16).

43. "So then I tell you, that the kingdom of God will be taken from you, and given to a nation yielding its fruits."

It is not strange that Jesus was crucified by acclamation in the same city which a few days before he had entered in triumph.

44. "He who stumbles on this stone will be sorely bruised; but him on whom it falls, it will crush to pieces."

He who is offended at my character and does not receive

my religion will suffer much ; but my enemies, my opponents, will suffer much more. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

XXII. 11. “ — a man who had not on a wedding garment.”

The meaning of our Saviour was, that among his professed followers there would be some who, neglecting to comply with the requisitions of his religion, would be unworthy of a place in his kingdom. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

14. “ For the invited are many, but the selected are few.”

See the note on ch. xx. 16.

15 – 22. (Answer of Jesus to the question of the Pharisees and the Herodians respecting the payment of tribute to Cæsar.)

The real, though indirect meaning of the question proposed to Jesus was this : Ought we to submit to the government of the Roman emperor, or ought we to rise in arms and resist it ? Some among the Jews, as we learn from Josephus, zealously maintained the latter opinion.

It may seem as if the question were a hazardous one to those who proposed it, as implying a tendency to rebellion in them. But the Pharisees, to whom the Roman domination was odious, took care, as appears, to be accompanied by Herodians, who, as partisans of Herod, a creature of the Romans, at least professed a willing adherence to the established rule, and who, in common with Herod himself, certainly had no wish that it should be overturned by one assuming the character of the

Messiah. Both parties were enemies of Jesus, and even the Roman governor would readily understand that their purpose was merely to ensnare him and effect his ruin.

How they thought this likely to be brought about will appear, when we consider how impatiently the Roman yoke was borne by the Jews, and that they were expecting their Messiah as a deliverer from its oppression. They had been insulted and injured through their religion, and hence their disposition to resistance was inflamed by religious zeal. There were those who regarded subjection to the Roman emperor as a breach of their allegiance to God. Even Herod, dependent and tributary as he was, would doubtless have been ready, had the occasion offered, to renounce his submission, and to restore in his own person the kingdom of his father. The nation, in general, was ripening for revolt, and hoping for the Messiah as a leader. If Jesus, therefore, had explicitly declared it to be right to submit to Cæsar, he would have been viewed as forfeiting all claim to be considered as the Messiah, and would have exposed himself to almost universal contempt and odium.

On the other hand, the danger of declaring or implying it not to be lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar is apparent. He might immediately have been accused before the Roman procurator, and put to death upon this charge.

It was with this well-concerted plot that his enemies came to him, in the hope that his answer to their inquiry would either, on the one hand, destroy all trust in him as the Messiah, or, on the other hand, afford the means of his destruction ; or, at least, that he would be so disconcerted by the question, that his authority with the people would be greatly lessened.

Jesus did not answer their question in the sense in which it was proposed ; but he did not avoid answering it through any

personal considerations, for how little he feared exasperating the multitude against himself appears from the parables and declarations which he had just uttered ; and he knew that his crucifixion was close at hand. He gave no direct answer, because, as a teacher from God only of the essential and universal truths of religion, it was a question with which he had no concern. On such an occasion as the present, and to such hearers as he addressed, nothing could have been more preposterous, than to have undertaken to explain the duties and relations of subjects towards their rulers, and to show how these were affected by the particular circumstances of the Jewish people. It was the duty of the Jews to become his followers ; and as regarded those who did become his followers, those to whom alone his words would be law, no directions were to be given concerning their political conduct. On them peculiar duties were imposed, and they were called to peculiar trials, which superseded all attention to the injuries or rights of their nation. Their obligations were to mankind.

That the Roman money was in common use among the Jews, was a mark of their being subject to the Roman emperor. The purport, therefore, of the reply of Jesus, was this : You pay your tribute in Roman coin ; you are then under the Roman government ; pay, therefore, those taxes that the government to which you are actually subject requires, and do not think that your doing so will interfere with the duties which you owe to God.

The enemies of Jesus could urge him no further. They could not go on to ask in express terms, Ought we to submit to this government ? The question in this naked form was too serious a one to be asked for the sake of trying what he might say, and would have exposed them to danger ; especially if,

in the discussion which might have followed, they had themselves said anything adapted to countenance the disaffected and gain their favor. Nor could any one, however zealous for the deliverance of his nation, have expected, that, in a city garrisoned by Roman soldiers, and the residence of the Roman procurator, Jesus, without any armed followers, should publicly answer in the negative the question supposed. Luke says (xx. 26), "They could not take hold of his words *before the people*," referring, as may reasonably be supposed, to the danger of pursuing any further the topic which they had introduced in the presence of the multitude.

23 – 30. (Answer of Jesus to the question of the Sadducees respecting the resurrection.)

The Sadducees, in asking this question, had reference to that resurrection of the just, which, the Pharisees taught, was to take place in the time of the Messiah. During his reign, as they believed, those who had been raised from the dead would live again on earth and enjoy its pleasures without exposure to death. This state of things was to continue a thousand years, at the end of which the life in heaven would commence. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

32. "*I am the God of Abraham,*" &c.

When God is spoken of in the Scriptures as being the God of particular individuals, the meaning is, that they stand in a peculiar relation to him, — that they are distinguished from the rest of men as peculiar objects of his love and favor, or as the recipients of special blessings. Thus it is said in the Apocalypse (xxi. 7) "He who overcomes shall inherit all things,

and I will be his God, and he shall be my son." See also the Epistle to the Hebrews, xi. 16. But Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had been selected by God for a special manifestation of his favor. In the sense just explained he had declared that he would be *their* God. It is not to be supposed, then, that he suffered them to perish at death.

41 - 45. (Question of Jesus to the Pharisees respecting the relation between the Messiah and David.)

"The Pharisees had low and very erroneous notions of their expected Messiah. They conceived of him as a temporal prince, at the summit of worldly grandeur. They regarded the title of 'Son of David' as honorable to him; meaning to express by it, not only that he was to be a descendant of David, but that in his power, in the splendor of his reign, in his deliverance of the Jews from their enemies, and in his exalting them to be a great nation, he was to resemble, however he might excel, his predecessor. These were the common notions of the Jews; and of these, the Pharisees, the enemies of Christ, without doubt took advantage. Appealing to the character of Jesus, to the professed objects of his ministry, and to all the circumstances of his condition, they asked the common people, Whether this man could be the Son of David? Of the nature of the office which God had conferred upon him, of that connection with the Almighty which opened to him the treasures of wisdom and power, of his moral elevation, of all that gave him an immeasurable superiority over David, as well as over every other individual, they had no conception nor feeling. In opposition to these low notions of the Messiah, which they abused

for the purpose of justifying themselves and their followers in their rejection of Christ, he, in the passage we are remarking on, opposes their own application of the words of David, as they supposed them to be, to the Messiah.* The purpose of his question may be thus expressed: ‘You object to me that I do not come as the Son of David, according to your notions of that title; but you at the same time believe that David regarded the Messiah as far superior to himself. Your notions of the Messiah are too mean when you imagine him to be the Son of David. How do you reconcile them with the opinion that David, under a divine impulse, called him Lord? The Messiah is indeed far superior to him; a greater than David is here.’ By the question of Christ, the minds of some of those who heard it might be led to reflection on the subject, and opened to more enlarged conceptions of the character of the Messiah. The words of the Psalm, it is likewise to be observed, though not originally spoken of Christ, were applicable to him, without conveying any error respecting his character.” — *On the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Christian Examiner, Vol. V. p. 58.

XXIII. 2. “The teachers of the Law and the Pharisees sit in the seat of Moses.”

“That is, they expound and administer the laws of the nation, they exercise an authority similar to that once held by Moses.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. p. clxvi.

* Our Saviour assumes this application as true, his object being to convict his opponents of error, even on their own principles.

See in Wetstein the quotations from the Rabbinical writers applying the Psalm here cited (Psalm cx.) to the Messiah.

3. “Whatever, then, they may direct you to observe, observe and do.”

“Submit to their authority, as ministers of the law, whatever may be their private vices.” The Levitical Law “was both the ritual and the civil law of the Jews. . . . Now in the simple performance of the ceremonies ordained by it there was no moral harm. What it prescribed might be innocently complied with. . . . But so far as the Levitical was the civil law of the nation, obedience to it was not merely innocent, it was a duty, binding upon the followers of Christ equally with the rest of their countrymen.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. pp. clxv, clxvi.

5. “They wear broad phylacteries, and wide fringes to their garments.”

Phylacteries were strips of parchment on which certain passages of Scripture were inscribed (viz. Exodus xiii. 1–10; 11–16; Deut. vi. 4–9; xi. 13–21), and which the Jews were accustomed to wear on the forehead between the eyes, and on the left arm, while at prayer. Their use was derived from a literal interpretation of Exodus xiii. 9, 16; Deuteronomy vi. 8; xi. 18.

On the wearing of fringes, see Numbers xv. 38, 39; Deuteronomy xxii. 12; Zechariah viii. 23. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

15. “You traverse sea and land to gain one proselyte; and when he is gained, you make him twofold more a child of hell than yourselves.”

Is there not here a particular reference to Judas, whom the

Pharisees had seduced from being a follower of our Lord, and brought over to their own party?

23. “These should have been regarded, and the other not neglected.”

“When reproving the teachers of the Law and the Pharisees for their affected scrupulosity in paying tithes of mint, anise, and cumin,” he declares (in the words just quoted) that, nevertheless, “it was a right principle that the Law was to be observed even in its minor requirements.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. p. clxvi.

24. “Blind guides! straining out a gnat, and swallowing a camel.”

The Jews, before laying up their wine for use, were accustomed to strain it, to avoid swallowing the gnats or other small insects which might have got into it while in the vat. Both the gnat and the camel were unclean animals according to the Levitical Law. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

25, 26. “You make clean your cups and dishes, but they are full of rapine and injustice. Blind Pharisee! That thy cups and dishes may be clean, first make clean what is put into them.”

In the original there is a merely verbal antithesis between ἐξωθεν and ἔσωθεν, ἐντός and ἐκτός, which cannot be preserved in a translation. As the same word in an antithetical sentence is often repeated, particularly in the Hebraistic style, with a change of meaning, so here words apparently opposite in

meaning are used, while the precisely opposite meanings are not intended. *Εξωθεν and ἐκτός do not here signify the outside of a cup or dish in the sense in which that phrase must be understood in English, namely, as synonymous with “the outer side,” but they mean “the surface,” or all that may be seen. We cannot suppose that the words were intended to represent the Pharisees as cleaning only the outer side of cups and dishes.

The verbal antithesis which here occurs may have been used by our Saviour because, in reference to the general subject which he had in mind, the antithesis becomes real and complete. He is exemplifying the *external* show of sanctity exhibited by the Pharisees, as contrasted with their *internal* depravity.

See the note on Luke xi. 39.

27. “You are like whitened sepulchres.”

Sepulchres were whitened to render them more conspicuous, it being esteemed pollution to touch them. See Numbers xix. 16. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

29 – 32. “Woe for you, teachers of the Law and Pharisees, hypocrites ! For you construct the sepulchres of the Prophets,” &c.

The teachers of the Law and the Pharisees affected great respect for the ancient Prophets, but they were now seeking the life of Jesus, the last and greatest of God’s messengers. They thus showed that they had the same dispositions as their fathers, and might be truly called “the sons of those who murdered the Prophets.” Jesus was indignant at their hypocrisy, and the language in which he addresses them is that of strong emotion. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

35. “— so that upon you shall come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar.”

“— so that upon you shall come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth.” That is, your punishment will be so terrible, that it will seem as if you were held responsible for all the righteous blood, &c.

“Zechariah, son of Barachiah.” Zechariah the son of Jehoiada is probably meant (see 2 Chronicles xxiv. 20, 21), whom Matthew appears from a lapse of memory to have confounded with Zechariah the prophet, the son of Barachiah. See Zechariah i. 1. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

37. “How often would I have gathered thy children together as a bird gathers her young under her wings, and you would not!”

The same figure occurs in Euripides, *Herc. Furens*, 70–72.

Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ σὺ μέλλομεν θνήσκειν, γέρον,

οἱ θ' Ἡράκλειοι παῖδες, οὓς ὑπὸ πτεροῖς

Σώζω νεοσσούς ὄρνις ὥς ὑφειμένη.

See also 2 Esdras i. 30, where it was probably borrowed from the Gospels.

38, 39. “Lo! your house is left you deserted; for I declare to you, You will not see me henceforth, till you shall say, Blessed be he who comes in the name of the LORD!”

With these words Jesus ended his ministry to the Jewish

people. He did not afterwards address them as a public teacher of religion. In departing from the temple for the last time, he tells them that their house (that is, the temple) was left to them deserted; deserted by him and deserted by God. The meaning of the figurative language which follows seems to be this: My ministry to you is ended. I am to be withdrawn from your sight. The blessings I have offered you will no longer be urged by me on your acceptance; nor can they be enjoyed by you till your dispositions are wholly changed, and you are ready with joy and thankfulness to behold in me a messenger from God. I may again be with you, not personally, but in the power of my religion, when you will be prepared to repeat such language as was uttered by the multitude who accompanied my entry into the city,—"Blessed be he who comes in the name of the LORD!"

"The words of Jesus [verses 37-39] are misplaced by Luke (ch. xiii. 34, 35), and their meaning obscured in consequence. It is obvious what a most striking conclusion they form to the discourse, if we regard it as it appears in Matthew.

"Till his business on earth drew toward its accomplishment, it would not have been the part of wisdom in Jesus to exasperate to the uttermost the passions of the Pharisees, especially under circumstances which put his life in their power. Nor, till his Apostles and other followers had been formed to their duties, as far as might be, by his personal influence, would it have been prudent to place them in such open and irreconcilable opposition to those whose sanctity, and whose authority as religious teachers, had been so revered by their countrymen. But the deadly hatred of the Pharisees was no longer to be avoided, it was to be encountered; and his followers had received, and were just about to receive in his resurrection from

the dead, evidence which could leave no doubt in their minds of his divine mission. Accordingly, though in Matthew's account of the preaching of Jesus we find previously strong expressions of censure upon the Pharisees, or upon some of their number, yet there is nothing at once so plain and unreserved in its meaning, so direct and general in its application, so terrible in its reproaches and denunciations, and pronounced so formally and solemnly to a public assembly representing the whole Jewish nation. Everything now conspired to give weight to his words. The utterance of them appears not as an incidental act of his ministry, but as purposed beforehand, as a main object of it; as a testimony delivered in the name of God, not against the character of the Pharisees alone, but against hypocrisy and bigotry, whatever forms they might assume." — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. ccvii, ccviii.

See, further, the note on Luke xi. 39 – 52.

Ch. XXIV., XXV. (Prophecy concerning the destruction of the temple, the desolation of Judæa, and the coming of the Son of Man.)

For an explanation of the language used by our Saviour in these two chapters concerning his "coming," see Appendix, Note E, pp. 527 – 531.

It is to be observed, that Matthew was not himself a hearer of the discourse here recorded. See Mark xiii. 3.

Verses 1 – 3 of ch. xxiv. refer to the declaration of our Lord ch. xxiii. 38, which denounced the destruction of the temple. Consider the state of mind into which his disciples must have been thrown, even if but imperfectly comprehending its meaning.

XXIV. 3. "What will be the sign of your coming, and of the end of present things?"

That is, What events will attend and mark your coming?

"The coming of the Messiah" and "the end of present things," in the question of the disciples, refer to the same period. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

7. "There will be famines, and pestilences, and commotions in divers places."

"— commotions," *σεισμοί*. See ch. xxi. 10, and xxviii. 2.

Origen speaks of comets as portending great changes upon earth, the fall of kingdoms, wars, or whatever can *σεισαι τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς*. Cont. Cels. Lib. I. c. 59. Opp. I. 373, D.

See the use of *σεισμός* in the Septuagint: Jeremiah x. 22; Ezekiel iii. 12, 13; xxxvii. 7; xxxviii. 19. Note also the common use of *σειώ* in the Septuagint: Isaiah x. 13; xiv. 16; Jeremiah viii. 16; xlix. 21; l. 46; li. 29; 1 Maccabees i. 28; —and elsewhere.

15, 16. "When, therefore, you shall see the desolating abomination, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing upon holy ground,—Let him who reads understand,—then let those who are in Judæa flee to the mountains."

"We doubt much whether the passages in Daniel here referred to (ix. 27; xi. 31; xii. 11) have any relation to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. But upon the supposition that they have not, the words of our Saviour may be easily explained. They are not a reference to a prophecy, but the application of a striking expression. But how little we

could, in any case, insist upon the precise words found in Matthew, may appear from the manner in which the same portion of our Saviour's discourse is recorded by Luke (ch. xxi. 20, 21) . — 'But when you shall see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that her desolation is at hand. Then let those who are in Judæa flee to the mountains.' " — *On the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Christian Examiner, Vol. V. p. 59.

"Let him who reads understand." These are words of the Evangelist.

17, 18. "Let not him who is on his house-top go down to take anything from his house," &c.

The language here used denotes the terrible nature of the calamity, rather than the suddenness of it. It would be such that a man should give up everything in order to escape. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

20. "Pray ye that your flight may not be a winter nor a Sabbath-day's journey."

The meaning is, Pray that your flight may not be when you can take only short journeys.

28. "But where the carcass is, there the eagles will gather together."

By "the carcass," an emblem of corruption and uncleanness, is meant the Jewish people ; by "the eagles" are to be understood, I think, those false teachers and false Messiahs, those excitors of commotion, the leaders of different parties, who would tear it in pieces and prey upon it. But if this be so,

Matthew has given a sense to the words different from that which appears in Luke. As they stand in Luke (xvii. 37), we must understand by "the eagles" the external enemies of the nation, the ministers of God in its destruction.

I have rendered γάρ in the beginning of this verse by *but*, because, according to a common use of it in Greek, it has, I conceive, a reference more remote than our conjunction *for* admits of; relating, that is to say, not to the proposition last made, but to those by which this is preceded.

31. "And he will send forth his angels with a loud sound of trumpets," &c.

The figure is borrowed from the Jewish custom of calling an assembly by the sound of trumpets. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

32. "Take a comparison from the fig-tree," &c.

Our Saviour means that these events will take place as *certainly*, after these signs, as summer succeeds the putting forth of the leaves of the fig-tree. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

35. "Heaven and earth may pass away, but my words cannot fail."

Observe here the Hebraistic construction remarked upon in the note on ch. vii. 22, 23. "Heaven and earth passing [*literally*, will pass] away"; that is, admitting that heaven and earth may pass away.

36. "But the day and the hour none knows."

This was said in reference to the request of the disciples (verse 3), "Tell us when this shall be."

37-41. "But as were the days of Noah, so will be the coming of the Son of Man. . . . Then two men will be in a field; one will be taken, and one left: two women will be grinding with a mill; one will be taken, and the other left."

These verses describe both the unexpectedness and the overwhelming nature of the calamity. Even those who might escape from it would be barely saved, after having been exposed to the greatest danger, their nearest companions having been destroyed.

42-51. (Exhortation of Jesus to his disciples in relation to his future coming.)

These words of Jesus are given by Luke (ch. xii. 39-46) as having been uttered by him on a different occasion and in another connection. As found in his Gospel, there is no difficulty in understanding their general purpose, which appears to have no relation to the subject of this prophecy. According to the manner in which they are introduced by Luke, it was the design of Jesus to teach that his followers, even the chosen ministers of his religion, were to expect no immunity on account of their peculiar relation to him, but were to be judged as other men; and that, however great the rewards assured to the faithful, they were liable, if unfaithful, to severe punishment. His coming to acquaint himself with their conduct is a figurative expression to denote that their condition hereafter will be determined by their good or evil deeds. As the rewards and punishments spoken of are those of the future life, the hour of his coming may be considered in respect to each individual as the hour of death. As the passage stands in Luke, the coming

of Christ does not denote the establishment of Christianity through its triumph over its enemies, the unbelieving Jews. It is determined by its connection to a different meaning.

The figure of the coming of Christ, as used in this passage, cannot refer to the destruction of the Jewish state. At the period of this event, no judgment was to be passed individually upon the followers of Christ. The passage, therefore, appears to be erroneously given by Matthew in connection with the preceding prophecy.

For this error it is not difficult to account. Instead of understanding the language of Jesus respecting his future coming as figurative, the Apostles generally appear to have regarded it as literal, and in consequence to have expected that he would personally reappear upon earth to triumph over his enemies and judge his followers. Now, connected with his prediction of the ruin coming upon the Jews, Jesus did exhort his disciples to vigilance and faithfulness, as appears not only from Matthew, but from Mark (xiii. 32-37) and Luke (xxi. 34-36). Such exhortations there are in the passage under consideration, given likewise with reference to a future figurative coming of Christ, though not his coming to inflict punishment on the Jews. But with the notions held by Matthew, as well as by the other Apostles, respecting a future *personal* coming, it is not strange that he should have introduced the passage in its present connection in his Gospel, especially as he appears on other occasions to have brought together sayings of Jesus uttered at different times, which he regarded as relating to the same subject.*

See in addition the note on Luke xii. 35-48.

* See, in relation to this characteristic of Matthew's Gospel, the notes on ch. v.-vii. and ch. x.

43, 44 “But this you know, that if the master of a house is aware at what hour a thief is coming, he is awake, and suffers not his house to be broken into. So then be you always ready; for in an hour in which you do not expect him, the Son of Man will come.”

The connection of thought in these verses may be thus explained. If the master of a house knows at what hour a thief is coming, he keeps awake; how much more reason is there for you to watch and to be always ready, who do not know at what hour the Son of Man is coming.

45, 46. “Happy will be that servant,” &c.

The construction of these verses is affected by a Hebraism, concerning which see Vorstius de Hebraismis, p. 211, seqq. Glassius, *Philologia Sacra*, I. 1366, ed. Dath.

Ch. XXV. (Conclusion of the discourse of Jesus concerning the establishment of his kingdom.)

In the preceding chapter (vv. 4–41) Jesus has spoken in figurative language of the destruction of the Jewish state, as an event in which his power and presence would be manifested, and as a final act necessary to the establishment of his kingdom, that is, to the establishment of Christianity. But Christianity is to be regarded as a most solemn and authoritative promulgation of the laws of God’s moral government, of that essential connection between the character and condition of individuals, which, however obscured in the present life, will be fully apparent in the future. The latter part of his discourse, as contained

in this chapter, is employed in enforcing this all-important truth in the plainest and most impressive manner. The train of thought is this. The Son of Man will come, his kingdom will be established, Christianity will be received as a divine dispensation, the laws of God's moral government will be recognized, and those laws, the laws of his kingdom, are such as will make a wide discrimination among men, corresponding to their performance or neglect of their duties. Our Saviour speaks in the future tense, saying, "The kingdom of Heaven *will be* like"; not that the rule of God over men, which is here meant by "the kingdom of Heaven," is not always the same, as regards its nature, but because the condition and obligations of men to whom Christianity was made known would be changed. His followers, those who received it as true, would be bound to higher duties and called to more strenuous exertions. They would have been enlightened and animated by a revelation from God of the essential truths respecting man's relations and prospects; while, on the other hand, those who, through their bad passions, their bigotry, or their other vices, rejected the call of God, would be subject to punishment to which they had not previously been exposed. We may also regard the use of the future as having reference to the apprehensions of men,—to what they would then perceive to be the character of the kingdom of Heaven, the rule of God.

See, further, Appendix, Note E, p. 530, seq.

13. "Watch, then; for you know not the day nor the hour."

That is, the day or the hour when you may be summoned, and should be prepared, to meet, in the future life, the consequences of your conduct in the present.

14 – 30. (The parable of the talents.)

See the note on Luke xix. 11 – 27.

XXVI. 2. (The Passover.)

It is of some importance, as will hereafter appear, to determine what day, or rather what period of time, is intended when the day of the Passover is spoken of. It has been supposed that the Jews began their day at sunset. The paschal lamb was sacrificed on the fourteenth day of their lunar month Nisan; but it was not eaten till the evening. According to the mode of computing the commencement of the day just mentioned, it was, therefore, not eaten till the fifteenth day of Nisan, which, consequently, has been considered as the day of the Passover.

But there is no satisfactory evidence, so far as I have been able to discover, that the Jews, in the time of our Saviour, ordinarily reckoned their days from sunset to sunset. The common arguments for this opinion may be found in Jennings's Jewish Antiquities, Vol. II. pp. 99, seqq. and Reland's Antiquitates Hebræorum. The supposed fact, however, is not proved, but asserted by these writers, as by many others.

On the other hand, some have supposed that the Jews reckoned their days from sunrise to sunrise, or, after their subjugation to the Romans, from midnight to midnight. See Hoffmann's Ed. of Pritius's Introduction to the New Testament, p. 549. Jennings, *ubi supra*. Lightfoot, Opp. I. pp. 507, 509. Reland, Antiq. Hebr. pp. 438, 456, cd. tert.

That the Jews did not end their day with the sunset, but regarded it as continuing till midnight or till the next sunrise, appears from John xx. 19, where the Evangelist says, "*In the evening of that day, the first of the week,*" with which may be

compared the account in Luke xxiv. 13 – 36. A like conclusion is to be drawn from the narrative of Matthew (xxvii. 57 – 62), according to which, Joseph of Arimathæa placed the body of our Saviour in a tomb, the *evening*, or rather *night*, after his crucifixion, while the Evangelist goes on to relate, that on “the next day, that following the day of Preparation,” the chief priests and Pharisees requested from Pilate a guard for the tomb. If the day following the day of Preparation, on which our Lord was crucified, had commenced at sunset, they must have made their request, not the next day, but the same day on which he was laid in the tomb. So also, in giving an account of the visit of the two Marys to his tomb on the day of the resurrection, Matthew says (ch. xxviii. 1) that it was “after the Sabbath, in the dawn of the first day of the week”; and Mark (ch. xvi. 1, 2) says that it was “when the Sabbath was past,” “very early in the morning of the first day of the week.” The Evangelists thus bring together these two points of time as coincident, or as approximating to each other. The observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest terminated at sunset. If the day itself terminated at the same time, we should not expect its ending to be mentioned in connection with the dawn of the next morning.

In the Old Testament, likewise, in Leviticus vii. 15, the direction is given respecting a peace-offering, that “its flesh shall be eaten the same day on which it is offered,” the offerer “shall not leave any of it till the morning”; which determines that the next day did not begin till the morning or the midnight after the day when the offering was made.

The same division of days is evident from Numbers xxxiii. 3. The paschal lamb was killed in the afternoon of the fourteenth of Nisan, and eaten the night following. It was

eaten on the day of the Passover. This would have been the fifteenth of Nisan, if this day began at the sunset of the fourteenth. But that such was not the case appears from this passage in Numbers, where it is said that the Hebrews “departed from Rameses on the fifteenth day of the first month, on the morrow after the Passover.”

It is directed in Exodus, ch. xii. 8, 10, that the paschal lamb should be eaten the night after it was sacrificed, and that no part of it should be left *till the morning*. Josephus (Antiq. Jud. Lib. III. c. 10. § 5) says, that no part was to be left *till the following day*. This proves that, in his time, the night after the day of the fourteenth of Nisan was considered as belonging in part or wholly to that day.

That the fifteenth day of Nisan did not commence at the sunset of the fourteenth, and that the Passover was eaten, not on the fifteenth, but on the fourteenth day, is likewise evident from the fact that the fifteenth day is expressly distinguished from the fourteenth, which is called the day of the Passover, in the directions concerning the celebration of the Festival of Unleavened Bread. “In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord’s Passover. And on the fifteenth of the same month is [*that is, commences*] the Festival of Unleavened Bread.” (Leviticus xxiii. 5, 6, and so also Numbers xxviii. 16, 17.)

The Passover was the day on the night of which the paschal lamb was eaten. It was regarded as commemorating that night on which the Lord, in destroying the first-born of the Egyptians, passed over the dwellings of the Hebrews. In the directions concerning it in the Old Testament, and in the notices of it by Josephus, it is uniformly spoken of as being on the fourteenth day of the month; and any mode of computing the

beginning and ending of days which would throw it forward to the fifteenth runs counter to the most decisive evidence, as being opposed to all the authentic information which we have concerning it.

According to the first three Evangelists, our Saviour was not crucified on the day of the Passover, but on the day following. He died on Friday. The day of the Passover, on the night of which he celebrated that rite with his disciples, was Thursday, extending either till midnight or till sunrise on Friday morning. Any supposed disagreement in these facts with the account of John will be considered hereafter.

In Genesis i. 5 it is said, according to one mode of understanding the passage, "and the evening and the morning were the first day"; and so with regard to the other days of the Creation. The Jews, understanding the words in this or in an equivalent sense, regarded the days of the Creation as represented to have begun with the evening. Abrabanel, after remarking on this opinion, which he adopts, goes on to say: "Et hujusmodi dies referuntur constituti a Deo in Sabbatis et solennibus diebus, qui cœperunt cum nocte, et finiti sunt die sequenti, qui hanc noctem excepit." (Abrabanel in *Legem*, quoted by Meyer de *Temporibus et Festis Diebus Hebræorum*, P. I. c. 10. § 9, in Ugolini's *Thesaurus Antiq. Sacr.* Tom. I. col. ccccli.) This passage proves that, in Abrabanel's opinion, days which were not sacred did not begin and end with the evening.

15. "And they gave him thirty pieces of silver."

That is, thirty shekels. The value of the shekel was about ~~sixty~~ cents. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

16. "And from that time he was seeking a good opportunity to deliver up Jesus."

This "opportunity" was found on the occasion of our Lord's spending the evening in Jerusalem.

18. "And he directed them to go into the city," &c.

"The city": — that is, Jerusalem.

24. "The Son of Man is going away, as has been written concerning him."

The words are thus given by Luke (ch. xxii. 22): "The Son of Man is going away, *as has been appointed.*"

26-28. "And while they were eating, Jesus took the loaf, and, blessing God, broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, 'Take, eat; this is my body. And taking the cup, and giving thanks to God, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood, the blood of the new covenant, shed for many to free them from their sins.'"

The view which should be taken of the acts and words of Jesus in distributing the bread and giving the cup is different, I believe, from that commonly presented. Those actions were, as I suppose, merely symbolical. They were intended to enforce on his Apostles, more effectually than could be done by words alone, the duties of mutual love and of unity of purpose.

Mutual love was essential to their Christian character; and a strong bond of union among themselves was necessary to their success as ministers of his religion. Jesus, therefore, took the occasion of this, his last, most solemn meeting with them before his death, a meeting which would ever remain present to their minds, to leave them, as his parting legacy, the precept, “Love one another,” made more impressive by the circumstances in which it was given, and the form in which it was conveyed.

The significance of the acts of our Saviour must have been perfectly intelligible to his disciples, though, from the change of manners, it may not be at once apprehended by a modern reader. Among the ancients, and particularly among the Orientals and the Greeks, friendship was contracted and pledged by taking food at a common table. *To share a table and salt* (where by salt is intended that used in seasoning the food), was a common expression to denote the existence of mutual friendship. *To transgress the table and salt* (to render verbally), was to be treacherous to the obligations contracted to another.

The symbolical acts of Jesus were, therefore, as readily understood by his disciples, as if he had said to them in figurative language, “Eat of the same loaf; drink from the same cup”; — figurative language, of which the meaning must be obvious to any one, even though ignorant of those associations which would anciently have given peculiar force to the words.

But the Apostles were to be pledged to one another, not merely as those partaking of the same loaf and the same cup, but as sharers in common of the blessings that their Master had been the minister of God in communicating to men, at the cost of a most cruel death, which he was to suffer in a few hours, — sharers of all those peculiar distinctions which they had received from him, — and sharers in that personal love and reverence

which was the result of their personal relations to him. Accordingly, his words to them were, "Take, eat; *this is my body.*" "Drink ye all of it; *for this is my blood.*" He had formerly represented the partaking of the blessings to be enjoyed through him as the partaking of his body and blood; and had dwelt upon this figure in the discourse held by him at Capernaum, which is recorded by John (ch. vi. 51-58). It was the partaking of blessings procured by his sufferings and death. When, therefore, he says: "Take, eat; this is my body. Drink, for this is my blood,"—in these brief and solemn words his meaning was: Regard yourselves as pledged to each other, not merely as those who partake of a common table, but as my disciples, partaking in common of blessings the ministering of which to you will be at the cost of agony and death to me.

Thus, with the same essential meaning, and the same reference to his own death, Jesus said to his Apostles: "My commandment is this, that you love one another as I have loved you. Greater love has no man than he who lays down his life for his friends."

Throughout his discourse to them, following the supper, as preserved by John, it appears how earnestly he endeavored to impress upon them the feelings and duties which the symbolical acts performed by him were intended to inculcate. The remembrance of those simple acts in all their significance must have been deeply affecting to them; for those acts had been associated by his own words with his death, with that death by torture which, a little after, filled them with horror, consternation, and doubt. How then must they have looked back upon this interview with their Master, when they recovered from those feelings to recognize him as the minister and representative of God!

Thus the purpose of Jesus in these acts and the words accompanying them appears a very obvious and a very important one. It is, at the same time, the only purpose which is evident in the accounts of Matthew and Mark, or of which it can be thought that they give any intimation. But it has been supposed that it was the design of our Lord to institute a rite commemorative of himself, to be for ever connected with his religion, and that he enjoined its observance on all his future followers. To this supposition it may seem a decisive objection, that no mention is made of such a purpose or such an injunction by the Apostle Matthew, who was present, nor by Mark, who may be reasonably believed to have preserved the apostolical tradition of the acts and words of Jesus, that is, the tradition of all those facts concerning them which the Apostles thought important to be published.

For some further remarks on the supposition that Jesus intended to institute a rite commemorative of himself, see the note on Luke's account of the Last Supper, ch. xxii. 19.

29. "And I tell you, I shall not drink hereafter of the produce of the vine, till the day when I shall drink a new kind with you in the kingdom of my Father."

"— a new kind," *καινόν*. "*Οἶνον καινόν* plures interpretantur *vinum præstantius, excellentius*, quæ tamen vocabuli significatio e libris N. T. et scriptis Hebræorum vix probari poterit. Præ placet Theophylacti hujus vocis expositio, *καινῷ τρόπῳ, alio modo, unter andern Umständen*, ut adeo *καινόν* positum sit pro *κατὰ καινόν* et *καινός* idem sit quod *ἕτερος*, quocum sæpius commutari ostendit Gatackerus in *Adversar.* c. 28." — Kuinoel.

Gataker (p. 724) thinks this passage illustrated by a comparison of Mark xvi. 17, γλώσσαις καιναῖς, with Acts ii. 4, ἑτέραις γλώσσαις. He says, “Aliud est νέος οἶνος, *vinum novum*, i. e. *mustum, nuper expressum* Matth. ix. 17 ; aliud καινός οἶνος, *vinum novitium, nuper invectum, peregrinum, extraneum, alienum ab eo quod est in usu.*” He then quotes passages from profane authors to show that καινός may be equivalent to ἕτερος, as denoting something of a different kind. He proceeds: “Hoc est ergo quod Dominus dicit ; Vinum se amplius cum discipulis suis non gustaturum deinceps, donec καινόν ἢ ἕτερον, *vinum novum, aliusmodi, diversi plane generis ac naturæ ab eo, quod cum suis tunc sumebat*, cum illis eisdem ad cœlestes sedes translatis, ad mensam suam, in regno patris sueque, bibat.”

With regard to the figure of feasting, here used to denote the happiness of Heaven, as Gataker supposes, he refers to Luke xiv. 15 ; xxii. 30.

41. “The spirit may be ready, but the flesh is weak.”

In this expression our Lord had, without doubt, reference to himself, and his immediate state of feeling. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

51. “And lo ! one of those who were with him drew his sword, and struck the servant of the high-priest, and cut off his ear.”

Compare Mark xiv. 47. Matthew and Mark proceed at once to the main fact, that Jesus was seized upon by those sent to apprehend him, and then mention a circumstance by which

this was preceded, namely, the bold act of Peter. Luke and John do not narrate in the same order. See the note on John xviii. 3 – 13.

52. “For all who take the sword will perish by the sword.”

These words cannot be understood as a universal proposition. Their meaning is limited by the circumstances in which they were spoken, and may be thus expressed: If you, my disciples, attempt to defend me or maintain my cause by the sword, you will perish by the sword.

54. “But how then would the Scriptures be fulfilled?”

That the words of Jesus uttered at this time of confusion and dismay, when he was probably separated from most of his disciples, would be accurately remembered and reported, is very improbable. Matthew, who sought for coincidences in the life of his Master with supposed prophecies of him, here ascribes words to Jesus which he himself doubtless understood as implying that the events taking place were in fulfilment of such prophecies; and so also does Mark. But should we regard these words as having been uttered just as reported, their meaning may be conceived to have been this: Your prophets and you have anticipated a great messenger from God; what they and you have anticipated, I am; but what is now taking place is necessary in order that I may fully sustain the character and perform the offices of such a messenger. It is not necessary to suppose that Jesus thought the predictions of the prophets miraculous or inspired, or believed them to be any-

thing more than expectations, founded on the peculiar relation to God in which the Jews were placed.

58. “And Peter sat down with those sent to apprehend Jesus.”

Μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν, not “with the servants,” for this would mean “domestic servants”; nor “with the officers,” for that would imply that they had some command. It denotes those who had just been sent to apprehend Jesus. See the use of ὑπηρέτης elsewhere, and particularly in John’s Gospel. We have no single word in English corresponding to it.

64. “You are now about to see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of God, and coming on the clouds of heaven.”

Compare Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69. The meaning of our Saviour was, There will be such displays of divine power in attestation of my divine mission, and such punishment will be inflicted on the Jewish nation for their rejection of me, as to leave no doubt of my being the Messiah.

69. “Surely you were with Jesus the Galilæan.”

The force of καί here and in verse 71 is merely intensive. It should not be rendered by “even” or “also,” either of which terms must convey a false or indistinct meaning. Its effect may be imitated by using the word “surely.”

XXVII. 2. “And having bound him, they carried him before Pontius Pilate, the governor, to deliver him up to him.”

Here follows, in our Greek copies of Matthew, an account of

the repentance and death of Judas, which may be thus translated :—

“Then Judas, who had put him in their power, seeing that he was condemned, repented, and carried back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have sinned in betraying the blood of an innocent man. But they said to him, What is that to us? Do you look to it. And he threw down the money in the temple, and withdrew, and went and hanged himself. But the chief priests, taking the money, said, It is not lawful to put it into the sacred treasury, since it is the price of blood. And after consulting together, they determined to purchase with it the Potter’s Field, as a burial-place for strangers. Hence that field has been called the Field of Blood to this day. Then was fulfilled what was said by Jeremiah the prophet :— *And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him who was appraised, whom the children of Israel appraised, and they gave them for the Potter’s Field, as the LORD had appointed for me.*” *

On this passage, and the reasons for regarding it as an interpolation, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. Additional Note A, Section V. II. pp. lxiv. — lxix.

18. “For he knew that Jesus had been brought before him through the malice of his accusers.”

* Ἦδει γάρ, ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν. The persons spoken of in this verse were the accusers of Jesus, the members of the Sanhedrim, not the multitude mentioned just before as addressed by Pilate. Compare Mark xv. 10 : “For he knew

* [See Zechariah xi. 12, 13. There is no passage in Jeremiah corresponding to the quotation.]

that the chief priests had brought Jesus before him through malice."

For other examples of a similar looseness of expression in the original, see the notes on Matthew xxi. 41 ; xxviii. 17.

27–29. "Then the soldiers platted a crown of thorns," &c.

Or, perhaps, "a crown of acanthus-leaves," στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν. For a description of the acanthus or bear's-foot, see Pliny, Hist. Nat. Lib. XXII. c. 34. — It appears from the whole account, that the crown was intended for mockery rather than torture. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

32. "And as they were going out of the city, they found a man, a Cyrenæan, Simon by name, whom they compelled to carry his cross."

Probably Simon was thus treated, because he was known to be an adherent of Christ, and the soldiers, therefore, took pleasure in insulting and tormenting him.

33. "And when they had come to a place called Golgotha, which means *Place of the Skull*."

"*Place of the Skull*"; — rather, simply "*The Skull*," as the name is given by Luke. The place was probably so called from a bare rock, presenting some resemblance to a human skull. The other explanations which have been given of the origin of the name seem to me wholly improbable.

42. “He saved others ; cannot he save himself ?”

The original cannot be adequately expressed in a translation. The meaning is : He delivered others from suffering and death, he cannot deliver himself. The enemies of Christ, as far as appears from the Gospels, never questioned the reality of his miracles ; they only contended that he performed them by power from Satan. We can hardly conceive a more deplorable state of mind than that of those who, witnessing his tortures, recollected his past works of mercy as a ground for derision.

46. “ *My God ! my God ! why hast thou forsaken me ?* ”

See Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, pp. 287 – 292.

48. “And one of them immediately ran and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave it to him to drink.”

During the intervals of faintness and partial insensibility produced by the agony of crucifixion, the soldiers appear to have offered drink to Jesus for the purpose of rousing him to a sense of his sufferings, and affording an occasion for the renewal of their scoffs. Luke (ch. xxiii. 36) says : “And the soldiers, too, mocked him, coming and offering him vinegar, and saying, If thou art the king of the Jews, save thyself.” Yet from the account of John (ch. xix. 28, 29) as well as from that of Matthew, one might infer that the person who offered him drink just before his death did it under an impulse of compassion. Nor is this inconsistent with the narrative of Mark (ch. xv. 36), though that narrative be in other respects irreconcilable with

this of Matthew. Mark ascribes to the individual offering drink words which Matthew assigns to the by-standers, the purport of which must have been altogether different as used by one party or the other.

52. "And the tombs were opened."

Here follow in our Greek copies of St. Matthew the words. "And many bodies of saints who slept were raised, and, leaving their tombs, after his resurrection, went into the Holy City and appeared to many." I have, for reasons which I have given elsewhere,* such doubts whether this passage made a part of the original Gospel, that I have not thought it proper to insert it in the text.

55. "And many women were there looking on from a distance, who had followed Jesus from Galilee to render him their services."

These were women who, as is mentioned by Luke (ch. viii. 3), "provided for his wants from what they possessed."

63. "In three days I shall be restored to life."

"In three days," *Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας*. See Kuinoel's note. See also Reland, *Antiq. Hebr.* p. 442, seqq.

XXVIII. 2-4. (The descent of the angel, &c.)

There seems no occasion to inquire from what source Matthew derived his account. Whatever the Roman soldiers may have been bribed to say publicly to the Jews, they would undoubtedly communicate facts so marvellous to their own com-

* Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. Additional Note A, Section V. III. pp. lxix. - lxxi.

panions, and being thus communicated, the report of them would soon spread.

2. “And lo! there had been a great commotion.”

“—there had been,” ἐγένετο. On the use of the aorist for the pluperfect, see Matthiæ’s Greek Grammar, § 497; Winer, Gram. § 41. 5. There was a particular reason for thus using the aorist of γίνομαι, as that verb has no pluperfect.

“—commotion,” σεισμός. See Markland’s note in Bowyer’s Conjectures. See also the note on ch. xxiv. 7.

11–15. (Report that the disciples of Jesus stole away his body while the guards slept.)

See Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, pp. 233, 234.

17. “And seeing him, they prostrated themselves before him; but they were in doubt.”

“But they were in doubt.” These words are obscure. As Jesus had appeared twice, and probably three times, to the Apostles, as we learn from John, they could have had no doubt about the reality of his resurrection. But it is not likely that they were the only persons present on this occasion. St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 6) says that Jesus, after his resurrection, “was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once.” This, it is reasonable to believe, occurred in Galilee, where far the greater part of his disciples resided. But the present meeting of the Apostles was by an appointment which we have no reason to think they were required to keep secret. If they did not keep it secret, all the disciples who heard of it would be likely to attend it; and it was probably at this time that Jesus appeared to a large number of them, as mentioned by St. Paul.

Supposing him, as is implied in Matthew's narrative, to have appeared first at a distance, some or many of this number may have for a short time doubted whether it were he; though their doubts were afterward removed, when he came to the Apostles and addressed them. The fact is unimportant in itself, but was likely to make an impression upon the mind of an Apostle who was present.

When, therefore, it is said that "*they* were in doubt," we may understand to be meant some or many of those present, beside the Apostles, whom the Evangelist has neglected to mention. This defective mode of narration, and inaccurate and ambiguous use of language, belong to the style of the Gospels. Unpractised in composition as the Evangelists were, they did not always remember that what was present to their own minds might not be so to those of their readers; and still less did they anticipate, that readers at the distance of many centuries would rely solely upon them for information respecting their Master.

For a change of the subject in two connected sentences equally striking, see Matthew xxvii. 17, 18, — and in two clauses of the same sentence, Mark xi. 6.

19. "Go and make disciples from all nations, baptizing them to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit."

"The meaning of this is, Go and make converts of men of all nations, dedicating them by baptism, through which they are to make a solemn public profession of their faith, to the worship of the Father, the only true God, to the religion which he has taught men by his Son, and to the enjoyment of those holy influences and spiritual blessings which accompany its reception." — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 153, where may be found

some remarks on the argument which this passage has been supposed to afford for the doctrine of the Trinity.

[That the views of the author respecting baptism and some other subjects may be more fully understood, the following extract is given from a private letter, dated the 6th of August, 1852.]

“I do not think that it was the design of Christianity — intended, as it was, for a universal religion — to establish any institutions, any religious rites. Such institutions and rites can be of no value except as means of goodness. But when they are believed to be expressly commanded, there is great danger lest an observance of them should be regarded as in itself meritorious, as what the Catholics call an *opus operatum*, and should be substituted for the attainment of the end, for the moral goodness which it is their proper purpose to promote. This subject leads to discussions on which I will not enter, except so far as to express my opinion that there may be circumstances in the case of a peculiar people, such as the Jews, which will render the positive appointment of religious rites a good more than counterbalancing the evils which naturally attend it.

“But there are religious institutions which, if voluntarily adopted, — means of goodness, which, if resorted to from free choice, from a sense of their utility, — may be highly beneficial. So far as this is the case, their observance is virtually commanded by God, and is not less obligatory than if enforced by express words. Such I consider the general observance of Sunday as a day of rest from labor, especially devoted to religious and moral improvement, and one which through its mere observance by a community is a recognition of the truth and obligations of religion.”

N O T E S

ON

THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

NOTES ON THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

I. 23 – 28. (The cure of the dæmoniac at Capernaum.)

The 28th verse implies that this miracle took place at the commencement of our Saviour's public preaching at Capernaum, as it seems to have been the first event which drew attention upon him in that part of the country. By a comparison with Matthew iv. 23 – 25, I think it appears that the account of it here is misplaced, and that it was performed, not on the day on which Jesus cured the mother-in-law of Peter, but at an earlier period. Matthew is the better authority, not merely as an Apostle, but as a resident at Capernaum. It does not appear that either Mark or Luke was a Galilæan.

45. "Jesus could no more go openly into the town."

By "the town" is meant Capernaum, the residence of Jesus when not engaged in his travels. So, in the next verse, "the house" is the house in which he usually dwelt in Capernaum.

Mark and Luke could not here have translated from a com

mon document; nor could Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in the succeeding narrative.

II. 4. "And not being able to get near him on account of the crowd, they removed a part of the awning over where he was, and, breaking through, let down the bed on which the paralytic was lying."

Compare Luke 7. 19.

"To understand the accounts of Mark and Luke, we must attend to the following considerations.

"Jesus was in the house in which he usually resided when in Capernaum, and which was probably owned by Peter. This, doubtless, was a small house,—the habitation of one who was not wealthy.

"The more common notion has been, that Jesus was in a chamber of this house; and that the roof over the chamber in which he was, was broken through. But this, I think, is an error.

"There are two objections to this conception of the circumstances of the case, either of which seems decisive. One is, that, when such a crowd was pressing to hear him, our Lord would not have retired to a chamber of a small house, that he might there address those only who could gain admission. The other is, that the breaking through of a roof over his head, with the inconvenience and disorder that it must have occasioned, would have been an act of such gross indecorum as is not to be imagined.

"In essential conformity, then, with an explanation given by Dr. Shaw (in his Travels, pp. 273–280), we are, I suppose, to conceive of Jesus as in the inner court of the house, the

place where, in the houses of Judæa and the neighboring countries, a large company was always received. The bearers of the paralytic, not being able to make their way to him through the crowd, ascended to the flat, terraced roof of the house, passing up stairs, which rose either from the porch or just by the entrance of the court, or perhaps passing over the roof of a neighboring house ; and from the roof where they were, they lowered the sick man down into the court.

“ There is no difficulty in thus understanding the account of Luke. Mark’s account requires a little further explanation. In this account, the word *στέγη*, rendered ‘roof’ in the Common Version, denotes, I conceive, conformably to common uses of it, the awning stretched over the court, as an awning often was. This the bearers of the sick man partially removed ; but having done so, the parapet, which, according to the usual mode of building, ran along the roof over the court, probably about breast-high, as Shaw says it is at the present day, presented an obstacle to their purpose. Over the parapet they would not undertake to lift their burden ; for this could not have been done with convenience or safety. They accordingly made an opening through it, which Mark expresses by the word *ἐξορύξαντες*, ‘breaking through.’ without mentioning what was broken through.

“ This is one instance, among many, of the imperfect style of narration found in the Evangelists. They did not advert to the fact, that what was clear to their own minds might not be equally clear to the minds of readers living many centuries after they wrote. They thought only of those who were familiar with the scenes and circumstances to which their narratives related.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. cxiii, cxiv, note.

18 – 22. The Evangelists evidently did not copy or translate from a common document; especially in verse 22. See Luke.

23, seqq. From ch. ii. 23 to ch. iii. 6 the three Evangelists did not copy a common document. Nor did Mark copy Matthew and Luke.

26. “In the days of Abiathar the high-priest.”

These words are ascribed to Jesus by Mark alone. Probably they are words introduced by the Evangelist himself, and they show a lapse of memory. According to the account in the Old Testament (1 Samuel xxi. 1 – 6) the event referred to occurred when Ahimelech, the father of Abiathar, was high-priest.

III. 4. “Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy?”

The question of Jesus is to be understood as equivalent to an indignant affirmation, that it is as lawful to do good on the Sabbath as it is unlawful to do evil. It refers to the designs against his life which his enemies were then meditating. Its full meaning may be thus expressed: Is it unlawful for me to do good on the Sabbath, and is it lawful for you to do evil? unlawful for me to save life, and lawful for you to kill?

7 – 12. Matthew and Mark had here no common document.

10. “For he cured many, so that all who were diseased crowded upon him to touch him.”

Note the implication here of what is expressed in Luke vi. 19.

19 – 31. Note the disjointed narrative, and the use of *αὐτοῦς* in verse 23.

23. “And calling the multitude to him.”

That is, calling them into the inner court of Peter's house, where he was.

31–35. “Then his kinsmen and his mother came, and, standing without, sent to call him,” &c.

This fact is not related by Luke in connection with the preceding discourse, but an incident to which it gave occasion (ch. xi. 27, 28). Luke's account of it is misplaced (ch. viii. 19–21).

IV. 10–20. (Explanation of the parable of the sower.)

Mark evidently did not copy Matthew. This appears also from the omission of the 18th verse of Matthew before the 14th verse of Mark; and from the very defective language of the verses which follow.

21, 22. See the note on Luke xii. 1–5.

•

24, 25. “And he said to them, Give heed to what you hear. For to him who has, more will be given,” &c.

The meaning is, that the benefit to be received through the ministry of Jesus would be proportioned to the attention given to his teaching; that he who had the dispositions which would lead him to attend would receive new blessings, but that from him who wanted those dispositions, even his present advantages would be taken away.

There seems to be sufficient reason for rejecting *τοῖς ἀκούουσιν* from the text, but not for striking out *καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν*, which appears to have been omitted by some transcribers only in consequence of the like ending of the preceding clause.

26 – 29. “The kingdom of God is as if a man should scatter seed upon the ground,” &c.

In this parable the religious truths taught by Jesus are compared to seed sown in the ground. Their growth and fruitfulness would depend upon the minds into which they would be received. The mind must act for itself, and when the proper fruits of these truths should be produced, the harvest would come. God would gather to himself those in whom they were brought forth.

30 – 32. (Parable of the mustard seed.)

Not copied from Matthew or Luke.

35. Observe the different use of *αὐτοῖς* in this and the two preceding verses.

36. “And leaving the multitude, they took him with them, as he was, in the boat; and there were other boats with it.”

The truth of the narration appears in this mention of an incidental and apparently unimportant particular.

38. “And he was in the stern asleep on the rower’s seat.”

It is not probable that Mark would mention anything so trifling as that the head of Jesus rested on a pillow, for this

must be the meaning of the rendering of the Common Version, — “asleep on a pillow.” Nor can τὸ προσκεφάλαιον be translated “a pillow.” The article denotes that the thing spoken of was something definite belonging to the boat; and that προσκεφάλαιον might be used to signify the cushion for rowers, or rather the leather covering of their seats, appears by the quotations from Hesychius and Suidas, given in Wetstein’s note on this verse.

VI. 9. “— and not to put on two tunics.”

This is the verbal rendering, yet the purport of the direction evidently was, not to forbid their wearing one tunic over another, but, as I conceive, to forbid their taking with them two tunics, one for common wear, and the other to be worn on particular occasions. See the note of Grotius.

See Winer’s *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, I. 662.

13. “And anointed many sick people with oil, and healed them.”

The Jews appear to have used anointing with oil both as a natural remedy, in certain diseases, and as a religious ceremony, accompanied with prayer, through which they hoped to obtain from God the recovery of the sick person. See James v. 14, 15. But, at first sight, it may well strike us with surprise, that individuals possessed of miraculous powers should have recourse either to a natural remedy, or to such a ceremony. The solution of the fact is to be found, I believe, in the want of confidence felt by the Apostles in their ability to perform miracles. Not being fully assured of their powers, they adopted in healing the sick such means as their countrymen had been accustomed to employ. The mission on which they had been

sent was their first essay as ministers of the new religion, and it was after this time that the faith of Peter failed him in his attempt to walk on the water, and that the Apostles through their want of faith, that is, their want of confidence, could not cure the dæmoniac boy while their Master was absent, and in consequence incurred his grave rebuke. (Matthew xvii. 14 - 21.) When the father of the boy says, "They could not cure him," we are to understand, I think, that they would not undertake his cure. The same want of confidence continued through the ministry of their Master, as appears from the strong language concerning it which he addressed to them but a few days before his death. See Mark xi. 22 - 24.

Nor is it strange that uneducated men, like the Apostles, from the lower classes of society, should have apprehended but slowly the part which they had been called to act. Amid the astonishment produced by the miracles of their Master, under continual strong excitement from the scenes through which they were passing, perplexed by much in his character and circumstances incongruous with their previous conceptions of the Messiah, and thrown into uncertainty in consequence of his being rejected and denounced by those whom they had been accustomed to obey as their religious guides, the minds of the Apostles could not readily settle down into any clear and steady convictions. But without such convictions, without an assured faith and distinct views of their duty and of their relation to God, to attempt to perform a striking miracle by a simple command of their own might naturally seem to them an act of criminal rashness and hardihood. Exorcism, indeed, had been long professed by some among their countrymen, and hence they might feel less reluctance in undertaking, according to the

common belief, to cast out dæmons, or in other words, to cure those disorders which were ascribed to possession by evil spirits. But, as regards other diseases, we find, upon a full view of the case, no difficulty in believing that their timidity led them to make use of anointing with oil. .

14. From this verse to the end of the Gospel the order of events is the same in Mark and Matthew.

52. “For they did not comprehend, notwithstanding the miracle of the loaves ; for they were slow to understand.”

“They did not comprehend.” That is, they did not comprehend the nature and extent of the miraculous powers of Jesus ; as we have before observed that they did not comprehend those powers which were proffered to themselves. (See the note on verse 13.) Jesus spoke to them in strong language of their dulness of mind, even after they had witnessed another miraculous supply of food to a multitude. See ch. viii. 17 – 21.

In order to understand how this might be, we must recollect the previous character and circumstances of the Apostles, that they were men originally of little knowledge and very limited views, unaccustomed to reflect or reason ; that those who took the lead among them had been fishermen, and that it is not probable that the others had been engaged in occupations more likely to enlarge their minds. They had been suddenly called away from their ordinary pursuits, to become the followers of one whose character was to them a perpetual mystery, one who impressed them with deep awe, but who placed himself in constant opposition to inveterate religious prejudices and misapprehensions which they shared in common with their countrymen.

As his followers, they were carried through a series of events altogether foreign from human experience, — events the most marvellous and astounding, breaking down, as it were, the barrier between the visible and the invisible world. It is with difficulty that we can conceive the almost appalling sense of sublimity with which a philosopher would have witnessed a miracle of Jesus. He, however, would at once have recognized it as a seal of divine authority. But the Apostles were not philosophers, and their notions concerning supernatural powers were as vague and unsettled as those of the rest of their countrymen. They were not prepared to draw those inferences which at once present themselves to our minds. They saw the miracles, but they did not distinctly refer them to their source, — the power of God in immediate action ; nor did they fully perceive and feel their true bearing as evidences that their Master was acting as God's minister. They did not know that what had once occurred would occur again if he willed it. They were uncertain as to the extent of his powers ; and hence, to the very close of his ministry, any miracle of an unusual character, as we perceive in the case of the blasting of the barren fig-tree but a few days before his death, excited their astonishment anew.

Such were the individuals who were to be formed by Jesus to be ministers of his religion, and who at last became qualified for this, the highest office ever intrusted to human beings, except that which was given to himself. And such as we see in the passage remarked upon, and in others of a similar character, were the accounts of themselves, which, in their simplicity, humility, and truth, they gave or sanctioned.

“ For they were slow to understand.” More literally, “ for

their minds were callous.” *Kαρδία* means, not ‘heart,’ but ‘mind,’ and *πεπωρωμένη*, literally ‘callous,’ means ‘slow to understand,’ ‘dull of comprehension.’ The true sense is not given in the Common Version, which renders, “For their hearts were hardened.”

VII. 3, 4. “Now the Pharisees never eat without washing their hands,” &c.

Note the proof that Mark wrote for Gentile readers in this explanation of the customs of the Jews.

There is one word in this passage, *πυγμῇ*, the meaning of which is so uncertain, that I have not attempted to render it. It relates to some peculiarity in the mode of washing.

“And on coming from the market, they do not eat till they have washed themselves.” See Kuinoel’s note.

Brazen vessels appear to be mentioned, because earthen vessels, if polluted, were not purified by washing, but were broken.

13. “And many like things do ye.”

These words, which seem rather to take from than to increase the effect of what precedes, and which are not found in Matthew, may be conjectured to be an addition of some reporter of our Lord’s discourse.

24-30. (The cure of the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman.)

The difference between this and the corresponding account of Matthew (ch. xv. 21-28) is one of the many examples which show that perfect accuracy is not to be looked for in the ac-

counts of the Evangelists. As in the present instance, they often vary from each other in minor particulars, concerning which one writer or the other, or perhaps both, must have been in error. In regard to the event here related, the narrative of Matthew is preferable to that of Mark. He affords us a glimpse of the manner in which the feelings of the Apostles were affected by the entreaty of the woman for her little daughter, and thus gives a new character to the account, suggesting the reason of the conduct of Jesus and of the language which he addressed to the woman. See the note on Matthew xv. 21 – 28.

31. “And again, leaving the neighborhood of Tyre, he returned, by way of Sidon, to the lake of Galilee, through the Decapolis.”

It would appear that Jesus went round the northern extremity of the lake of Galilee, and, coming on its eastern side, passed through the Decapolis to its shore.

32 – 37. (The miraculous cure of a deaf man.)

It may be doubted whether Mark was correctly informed respecting this miracle, or that reported by him in the next chapter, vv. 22 – 26. He relates in general more circumstantially than Matthew or Luke, and introduces the mention of incidents which are not essential to the main fact, and concerning which, therefore, there was particular liability to error. At the same time the powers of mind which he discovers afford no ground for supposing him able to exercise, in the few cases in which it might be required, any peculiar discrimination and judgment in regard to the accounts which he had heard. The narrative in these verses, and that referred to as in the next chapter, are found in his Gospel only.

When we compare the account here given with what is related by Matthew xv. 29 - 31, that Jesus at this time and place cured *many* diseased and maimed persons, we can hardly suppose that he gave a strict charge that this particular miracle should not be published. Matthew mentions no injunction of secrecy whatever. Possibly the representation of Mark was founded on the circumstance, that Jesus, having retired for a time from the usual scenes of his ministry to escape from the excitement of the multitude and the plots of his enemies, directed those who were about him not to go around publishing to others the place where he was. But it is highly improbable that, while performing many miracles, he should have given a charge to the multitude that this particular one should be kept secret; especially as it was morally certain, that, in regard to the numerous miracles which he was performing at the same time, and in the same neighborhood, such a charge would be wholly without effect.

The thirty-seventh verse in Mark corresponds to the thirty-first in Matthew. In Matthew, the astonishment and admiration of the multitude are sufficiently accounted for. In Mark, we cannot understand how those feelings should have been so strongly excited by a miracle as little striking for a display of divine power as any which our Saviour performed.

We can discern no reason for the extraordinary manner in which our Lord is said to have performed this miracle. But that he should have adopted this mode of performing it, without some sufficient and peculiar cause for doing so, is not to be believed. With one exception, the other Evangelists represent his miracles as having followed immediately the simplest expression of his will, without any intermediate action employed as if to effect them. The exception to which I refer is the

miracle of restoring sight to a blind man on the Sabbath, related by John in the ninth chapter of his Gospel. But, as I believe, a satisfactory account may be given of the peculiar reason which led our Lord to perform this miracle in the manner in which he did. (See the note on John ix. 6.) The fact, however, that he once performed a miracle in this manner may have given rise to erroneous reports that he performed others in a similar manner.

Among the strange circumstances which, as Mark relates, attended this miracle, it is said that our Lord "looked up to heaven and groaned." No occasion appears for his having done so; and particularly, no reason for his having done so in performing this miracle more than in performing any other.

Putting out of view the extraordinary manner in which Mark represents this miracle as having been performed, it is one of the least striking of the miracles of our Lord. It was the cure, not of a deaf and dumb man, but merely of a deaf man who had an impediment in his speech. It is unlikely, therefore, that it should have been selected by the Apostles to have been preserved and promulgated among those oral accounts given by them of our Lord's ministry, on which we believe the first three Gospels to have been founded. Accordingly, we find that it is not mentioned either by Matthew or by Luke.

From all that has been said, we may, perhaps, conclude that Mark did not derive his narrative of this miracle from an Apostle or an eyewitness. Besides the accounts of our Lord's miracles given by the Apostles, many others must have been in circulation, and a large portion of these must have been more or less inaccurate. It belongs to the nature of events so marvellous and so exciting, that the reports of them should be mixed with fable, except when these reports are those of eye-

witnesses, conscientiously scrupulous to relate only the truth. We may suppose Mark to have been misled, in the case both of this miracle and of that related in the next chapter, by some account that had suffered from addition and corruption.

VIII. 22–26. (The miraculous cure of a blind man.)

This narrative, like that in ch. vii. 32–37, is peculiar to Mark. See the preceding note.

22. “And he went to Bethsaida.”

By the name Bethsaida some have supposed to be meant the city of Julias, on the east side of the Jordan, where that river enters the lake of Galilee at its northern extremity. But this supposition is untenable, as Mark calls the place of which he here speaks *κώμη*, a *village*, or *small town*. It denotes, therefore, the Bethsaida on the western shore of the lake, near Capernaum, which is everywhere else in the Gospels intended by that name, unless Luke ix. 10 should be considered an exception. See the note on that passage.

IX. 12. “And he answered them, ‘Elijah is to come first, and reform all things!’”

Here, as in the corresponding passage in Matthew (xvii. 11, on which see the note), Jesus is to be understood as repeating the words of the teachers of the Law, for the sake of remarking upon them.

13. “They have treated him after their pleasure, as it has been written concerning him.”

There being nothing in the Old Testament which can be

considered as applicable to the treatment of John the Baptist, we may believe the words, "as has been written concerning him," to have been added in process of time to the oral report of what was actually said by Jesus. It was the tendency of the age, of which his followers partook, to suppose whatever concerned the Messiah to have been, in one way or another, predicted in the Old Testament.

26. "And uttering a cry, and convulsing him much, it came out of him. And he was as if dead ; so that many said, He is dead."

The violence of the disease, manifested at the very moment before the cure, showed the reality of the miracle.

33 – 50. (Jesus rebukes the rivalry among his Apostles.)

The imperfection of this narration, from which alone we could not discern the connection and bearing of the different parts, appears by a comparison of it with that of Matthew (ch. xviii.). The account of Luke (ch. ix. 46 – 50) is still more brief and defective.

38. "We saw one not of our company casting out dæmons by your name, and we forbade him, because he is not of our company."

"— one not of our company," &c. Both the clauses, *ὅς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν*, and *ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν*, are, I think, to be retained. Transcribers, perceiving that one of them was superfluous, sometimes struck out the former and sometimes the latter.

The person mentioned by John, though not a follower of

Jesus, regarded him as possessed of very extraordinary powers, so that his name might be used in exorcism, as that of Solomon had been by the Jews. (See Josephus, *Antiq. Jud. Lib. VIII. c. 2. § 5.*) In this state of mind he was prepared to be a believer. The purpose of what was said by Jesus (vv. 39, 40) appears to have been to repress the disposition of the leading Apostles to exercise authority not only over his other followers, but over those who might be disposed to become his followers. There had probably been a dissension between James and John on the one part, and Peter on the other, about the exercise of such authority in the particular case which John laid before his Master.

39. “No one who does a marvel in my name can at the same time speak ill of me.”

“— at the same time,” or “immediately,” *ταχύ*. So *Lenfant, en même temps*.

41. “Whoever shall give you a cup of water to drink, because you are followers of the Messiah, will not fail of his reward.”

This verse is to be taken as connected with the thirty-seventh.

“— because you are followers of the Messiah,” *ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε*. This is the only place in the Gospels in which the disciples are spoken of as “being the Messiah’s,” or “being followers of the Messiah.” That this character is ascribed to them here, corresponds with the purpose of the discourse.

49. “For every one will be salted with fire, and every sacrifice will be salted with salt.”

“For every one will be salted with fire.” That is, Every

one of the wicked will be sprinkled with fire as with salt. It is not uncommon in an antithetical sentence for the leading word to be used in one of the clauses in a sense very remote from its primary signification, and this license particularly occurs in the Oriental style.

“And every sacrifice will be salted with salt.” There is here an allusion to the Jewish practice of sprinkling sacrifices with salt. (See Leviticus ii. 13.) The word *salt* is used metaphorically with reference to its being regarded as an emblem of purity and incorruption, that purity and incorruption with which they would be endued who offered themselves up to God.

X. 32. “And they were on the road going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was leading the way; and they were astonished, and followed him in fear.”

The astonishment and fear of the disciples arose from our Saviour's taking this journey to Jerusalem, where his life had repeatedly been in danger, and where, as they knew, he was particularly exposed to the malice and power of his enemies. See John v. 16, 18; vii. 1, 30; viii. 20, 40, 59; x. 31, 39; especially xi. 8 and 16.

Compare verse 17.

XI. 12–14. (The withering of the barren fig-tree.)

Though the season for figs had not come, there might have been a few remaining on the tree throughout the winter, and ripening among the leaves in spring, as is sometimes the case. But it is not probable that Jesus expected to find any fruit, thus out of season, on a tree by the road-side exposed to passers-by.

The whole transaction was symbolical of the character and fate of the Jewish nation, — of the punishment about to be inflicted upon it for yielding no fruits. The thoughts in the mind of Jesus are explained by the parable in which he had, probably but a short time before, compared the nation to a barren fig-tree (Luke xiii. 6–9), and by that delivered on this or the next day, in which he represented the Jews as husbandmen who of the produce of the vineyard intrusted to them returned nothing to the owner. (Matthew xxi. 33–44; Mark xii. 1–11.) It is a common figure to call good works *fruits*.

We may conceive of Jesus as returning in the morning from Bethany by the road over the Mount of Olives, whence Jerusalem lay displayed before him, his mind oppressed with the thoughts of what he was to find in the city which he was just about to enter, and of the little effect which had been or would be produced upon his countrymen by his ministry, now almost ended. The Apostles were probably surprised at his looking for any fruit from the fig-tree. So vain he felt it was to expect fruit from the Jewish nation; and the consequent ruin of the nation he typified by the miracle he performed. He foresaw its destruction now, as when, the day before, in approaching Jerusalem, he beheld the city and wept over it.

On the difference between the accounts of Matthew and Mark, see Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. p. cxxv, seq.

16. “And suffered no one to carry any article through the temple.”

The meaning seems to be, that, besides removing those traffickers who were stationary, he suffered no one to go about the courts of the temple, bearing articles for sale.

XII. 1. "And he spoke to them in parables."

Mark himself relates only one parable; Matthew, however, gives others. The mention of *parables*, therefore, in this place, may tend to confirm the truth of both histories.

5. Note the irregular construction of the original.

19. Note the very inartificial construction.

XIII. 33. "Take care, be vigilant, and pray;" &c.

A general direction, founded on the preceding prophecy, to be always prepared for the coming of the Lord.

XIV. 12. "And on the first day of Unleavened Bread, when the lamb for the Passover is killed."

These words afford proof that Mark wrote for Gentiles, for whom the explanation was necessary.

15. "And he will show you a large upper room, ready furnished."

"— ready furnished"; more literally, "furnished with couches"; prepared, that is, with couches for reclining on at table.

69. (The denial of Peter.)

Note the discrepance from Matthew. Luke differs from both Matthew and Mark. In this account concerning Peter, the great correspondence between Matthew and Mark seems to show that they had both derived their information immediately from Peter. Luke received his at second hand, and John relates from personal knowledge. It is very remarkable that

the story, being of such a character, is related by all four of the Evangelists.

70. The clause *καὶ ἡ λαλιά σου ὁμοιάζει*, marked as doubtful by Griesbach, was omitted in some manuscripts through the like ending of the preceding clause in the original. Were there an interpolation here, the language of Matthew would have been copied.

72. “And he wept bitterly.”

Καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε. — *Ἐπιβάλλω* (with an ellipsis of *ἑαυτόν*) often implies doing a thing with violence; and is here, I believe, to be so understood. Schleusner gives the same sense to the passage. Peter undoubtedly would express himself very strongly when speaking of his own feelings; and the uncommon use of language here was perhaps derived from him.

XV. 21. “— one Simon, a Cyrenæan, (the father of Alexander and Rufus).”

This particular specification, and the mention of the names of three individuals, affords evidence of the facts related. But it may be further observed, that, according to early accounts, Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome, while there as the companion of Peter, for the immediate use of the disciples of the Apostle. Now in mentioning Simon as the father of Alexander and Rufus, he assumes that the two last-named individuals are likely to be known to many of his readers; and, corresponding with this, we find a Rufus residing at Rome, to whom St. Paul sends a salutation (Romans xvi. 13), and an Alexander likewise at Rome, whom he speaks of as having done him much evil (2 Timothy iv. 14), both, it is evident, persons well known to the Christians in that city.

41. “And Salome, who had accompanied him in Galilee.”

Salome is mentioned by name nowhere in the New Testament except here and in the first verse of the next chapter. From a comparison of the verse before us with Matthew xxvii. 56, it has been conjectured that she was the wife of Zebedee, and the mother of John the Evangelist and James his brother.

XVI. 1. “And the Sabbath being past, Mary of Magdala, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought perfumed oils to anoint the body of Jesus.”

The observance of the Sabbath ending at sunset on Saturday, they bought the ointments after that hour.

(The conclusion of Mark's Gospel, being verses 9 – 20 of the Received Text.)

As has already been remarked (see before, pp. 5, 6), “there is ground for believing that the last twelve verses of this Gospel were not written by the Evangelist, but were added by some other writer to supply a short conclusion to the work, which some cause had prevented the author from completing.” See Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. Additional Note A, Section V. iv. pp. lxxii. – lxxx.

The passage in question may be thus translated: —

“But Jesus, having risen early the first day of the week, appeared first to Mary of Magdala, from whom he had cast out

seven dæmons. She went and told those who had been with him, who were mourning and weeping. But when they heard that he was alive and had been seen by her, they did not believe it.

“Afterwards, as two of them were walking into the country, he appeared to them in another form. And these went and told the others, who would not believe even them.

“Afterwards he appeared to the eleven as they were at table, and reproached them for their want of faith and their perversity in not believing those who had seen him after his resurrection.

“And he said to them, Go to all the world, and preach the Gospel to the whole creation. He who believes and is baptized will be safe; he who disbelieves will be condemned. And these signs shall accompany those who believe; in my name they shall cast out dæmons; they shall speak new languages; they shall take up serpents; if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them;* they shall lay their hands on the diseased, and they shall be made well.

“Then, after the Lord had spoken to them, he was taken up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God. And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming their teaching by the miracles accompanying it.”

* This passage appears to be founded on the figurative language used by our Lord which is preserved by Luke, ch. x. 19.

N O T E S

OR

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

VOL II

NOTES ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

I. 1 – 4. (Luke's Introduction to his Gospel.)

“ Different interpreters have understood some of the expressions in this passage in different ways; but with variations which do not affect the main purpose for which I have quoted it. I have adopted that sense of the words which seems to me most probable. In the last clause, my rendering is different from any that I recollect to have seen (‘that you may know the truth concerning the relations which you have heard’). Most modern expositors agree in effect with the Common Version, in understanding St. Luke as meaning, ‘that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed’; that is, that thou mightest know that they are certain. But the words of Luke are, *ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ τῶν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*, and I conceive *λόγων* in the genitive to depend upon *περί* and not upon *ἀσφάλειαν*. The obvious meaning of St. Luke, if his words are to be thus constructed, is, that he wrote in order that Theophilus might know *τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*, ‘what was to be relied upon,’ that is, ‘the truth,’ in relation to the accounts he had heard. This meaning seems best to suit the context. A proper cause is assigned for the composition of an accurate history by one who had diligently inquired into the

facts ; while, if the object of Luke had only been to assure Theophilus of the certainty of what he had *already* heard, it may seem that his simple affirmation would have been most to the purpose. To an unbeliever or a skeptic of those times, the mere history of Luke would have afforded no new evidence. A believer, as there is no reasonable doubt that Theophilus was, had been already convinced of the truth of Christianity ; and if the term λόγος is, as I conceive, to be understood in the sense of ‘narratives’ respecting the life of Christ, St. Luke surely did not mean to vouch for the truth of all that Theophilus might have heard. Many incorrect and false accounts respecting Christ must have been in circulation in the times of the Apostles ; accounts which first were contradicted by their oral narratives, and afterwards by the written narratives of the Evangelists ; and it is, I think, a want of attention to this fact which has prevented the words of Luke from being correctly understood.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. clxxi, clxxii, note.

See also the same work, Vol. I. pp. cli, clii.

I. 5 – II. 52. (Narrative of the birth of John the Baptist, and of the nativity and early life of Jesus.)

“I agree with many critics in supposing that the account of the nativity given by Luke existed in a written form in Hebrew, previously to the composition of his Gospel, in which he inserted a translation of it, perhaps his own, perhaps one already made. The language differs from that of the rest of his Gospel, as being more conformed to the Hebrew idiom ; and the cast of the narrative has something of a poetical, and

even fabulous character, very different from the severe simplicity with which he, in common with the other Evangelists, relates events in his own person. But his adopting this narrative proves that he regarded it as essentially true; and he would not have so regarded it, had not the *main fact* of the miraculous birth of Jesus been believed to be true by the Apostles and other early Christians with whom he associated. Now, considering that two and probably three of the Apostles* were relatives of Jesus, and that others of their number, as John, were familiar with his mother and family, there can be no doubt that the belief of the Apostles rested on information derived from them." — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. lvii, lviii.

"When we turn to the narrative of Luke, no important difficulties will, I think, present themselves to the mind of one who has not determined to reject the belief of all miraculous interposition. The narrative is, as I have said, in a style rather poetical than historical. It was probably not committed to writing till after the death of Mary, and of all the other individuals particularly concerned. With its real miracles, the fictions of oral tradition had probably become blended; and the individual by whom it was committed to writing probably added what he regarded as poetical embellishments. It is not necessary to believe, for example, that Mary and Zechariah actually expressed themselves in the rhythmical language of the hymns ascribed to them; or to receive as literal history the whole account respecting the birth of John the Baptist, or of the different appearances of an angel announcing himself as Gabriel.

* James the son of Alpheus and his brother Judas, and probably Simon the Zealot." See the note on Matthew xiii. 55.

With our present means of judging, however, we cannot draw a precise line between the truth and what has been added to the truth. But in regard to the main event related, the miraculous conception of Jesus, it seems to me not difficult to discern in it purposes worthy of God. Nothing could have served more effectually to relieve him from that interposition and embarrassment in the performance of his high mission, to which he would have been exposed on the part of his parents, if born in the common course of nature. It took him from their control, and made them feel, that in regard to him they were not to interfere with the purposes of God. It gave him an abiding sense, from his earliest years, that his destiny on earth was peculiar and marvellous ; and must have operated most powerfully to produce that consciousness of his intimate and singular connection with God, which was so necessary to the formation of the character he displayed, and to the right performance of the great trust committed to him. It corresponds with his office ; presenting him to the mind of a believer as an individual set apart from all other men, coming into the world with the stamp of God upon him, answerably to his purpose here, which was to speak to us with authority from God." — *Ibid.* Vol. I. pp. lxiii, lxiv.

See also the same work, Vol. I. pp. 80, 81.

I. 5. "Of the family of Abijah."

See 1 Chronicles xxiv. 10.

15. "Neither wine nor any strong drink will he drink."

That is, He will lead the life of a Nazarite. See Numbers vi. 2, 3. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

32. “He shall be great, and a son of the Most High.”

See before, p. 30, note †.

62. “Then they questioned his father, by signs, how he would have him named.”

This seems to be an oversight in the account, as nothing before or after would lead us to suppose that Zechariah was deaf as well as dumb.

II. 7. “And she laid him in a stable, because there was no room for them in the inn.”

On the prevailing tradition that our Lord was born in a cave, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. 223. “At the present day, in the East, caves, it is said, are sometimes used for stables. The alleged cave of the Nativity is still shown at Bethlehem.”

34. “Lo ! this child is appointed for the falling and rising of many in Israel.”

That is, He will produce great changes. Those who are on high will be brought down, and those who are low will be raised. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

35. “— so that the thoughts of many minds will be revealed.”

In the time of the Messiah the principles of men will be thoroughly tried, and the true character of many will be made manifest. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

III. 1. “In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar.”

The fifteenth year of Tiberius began the nineteenth of August, A. D. 28.

7. Compare Matthew iii. 7, and note the imperfect narrative of Luke.

23. “And Jesus was about thirty years old when he began his ministry.”

“— when he began his ministry.” The sense in which Luke here uses ἀρχόμενος is determined by his use of ἀρξάμενος, Acts i. 22. Compare also Acts x. 37.

IV. 21. “Now has this scripture which you have heard been fulfilled.”

The passage of Isaiah here referred to (lxi. 1, 2) relates to the commission of the prophet to announce to the Jews their approaching deliverance from captivity. Our Saviour simply meant to represent its language as *applicable* to himself. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

On the use of the verb πληροῦν, *to fulfil*, see the note on Matthew iv. 14.

25 – 27. See 1 Kings xvii. 9; 2 Kings v. 1 – 14.

31. “Capernaum, a town of Galilee.”

“A town of Galilee”: — an explanation intended for Gentiles.

40. “All the sick.”

Note the looseness of the expression, πάντες ὅσοι.

V. 1–11. (The miraculous draught of fishes. Peter, James, and John become followers of Jesus.)

Compare Matthew iv. 18–20 and Mark i. 16–18, where different circumstances are related, but such as are not inconsistent with the narrative of Luke. The account in John i. 35–42 relates to an earlier period, when Peter and the other disciples there mentioned first became acquainted with Jesus, but did not, as on the present occasion, leave their occupation to become his followers. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

Matthew and Mark represent the call of Peter as taking place *before* the public appearance of Jesus at Capernaum. On the want of chronological order in Luke's Gospel, of which the misplacement of this event is one example, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxviii, note.

12. “And when he was in one of the towns,” &c.

According to Matthew (ch. viii. 1–5), the cure of the leper was performed near Capernaum. “In Luke's Gospel there are many clear indications that he had but an imperfect knowledge of the succession of events, and was often uninformed of the particular place where they occurred.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxvii, where see the note.

19. “They got on the top of the house, and lowered him down from the roof, on his bed, into the midst, before Jesus.”

“— from the roof,” διὰ τῶν κεράμων, — “which is equivalent to the Latin *per tegulas*, and does not, any more than the Latin words, signify ‘through the tiling,’ or ‘through the roof.’ To

render verbally, we should say ‘by way of the roof,’ but the meaning is here more intelligibly expressed by saying ‘from the roof.’ — See Wetstein’s N. T. Vol. I. pp. 558, 559, and Kypke’s *Observationes Sacræ*, I. 230. See also Shaw’s *Travels*, pp. 273 – 280.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxii, note.

See, further, the note on Mark ii. 4.

VI. 1. “And on the Sabbath called *Deutero-proton*.”

It cannot be ascertained what is meant by the epithet *Deutero-proton*, but the Sabbath mentioned must have been after the Passover, for at the Passover neither barley nor wheat was ripe enough for the grains to be rubbed out by the hand.

Perhaps the Sabbath following the Pentecost [the *first* Sabbath after the *second* in order of the three great Jewish festivals] is intended. See Appendix, Note B, p. 492.

12 – 49. (The Sermon on the Mount.)

“It is, I think, evident, that Luke confounded the discourse called the Sermon on the Mount, which Jesus, as related by Matthew, delivered before his public appearance in Capernaum, with that which he addressed to his Apostles immediately after their appointment (Matthew ch. x.). Luke (ch. vi. 12 – 49) represents our Saviour upon this occasion, not as giving to his newly-appointed Apostles the appropriate directions referring to their peculiar duties, which according to Matthew, himself an Apostle, he actually did, but as delivering the Sermon on the Mount; at the close of which he relates, that Jesus entered Capernaum, and cured the servant of a centurion. To the last events, Matthew assigns the same relative order in reference

to the Sermon on the Mount. By Luke, the whole appears to have been introduced out of its proper place." — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. cxviii, cxix, note.

17. "And Jesus descended the mountain with them, and stood on the plain, where was a crowd of his disciples, and a great number of people from all Judæa and Jerusalem and the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon."

The crowd of disciples and others who followed Jesus were mostly Galilæans. Hence it is that those from Judæa, particularly Jerusalem, and from the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon, are especially mentioned.

20. See the note on Matthew v. 3.

27 - 36. Some confusion is produced in these verses by blending together precepts relating to three different, though closely allied subjects, — the love of enemies, irrisistance to injury, and disinterested benevolence toward all men, — especially as the precepts relating to the first and last subjects are of universal obligation, while those enforcing the passive endurance of wrong were founded on the peculiar circumstances of the Apostles and first disciples of Christ. This confusion does not exist in Matthew.

38. Note the use of *δώσουσιν* without a subject expressed. See Vorstius de Hebraïsmis, p. 578.

39 - 45. "Then he spoke to them in a figure: — Can the blind lead the blind?" &c.

The sayings of Jesus contained in these verses appear to

have been brought together by Luke with reference to the qualifications of a moral and religious teacher required in his Apostles and others of his disciples. To this subject they are *applicable*, and had, we may readily suppose, been occasionally applied in the oral discourses of the Apostles; but many of them, as we may judge from the connection in which they stand in Matthew, were not uttered in direct relation to it by Jesus himself. Thus, according to the latter Evangelist, the figure of the blind leading the blind was used to express the ignorance of the Pharisees concerning true religion, and the consequent danger that men would be led to destruction under their guidance; * — the language respecting a straw in our brother's eye and a beam in our own relates to the disposition to censure the faults of others while we commit much greater ourselves; † — the direction to judge of men by their deeds, as a tree is judged of by its fruit, was not uttered by Jesus in enforcing upon his Apostles the proper qualifications for their mission, but in warning them against the false teachers among the Jews; ‡ — and in speaking of bringing forth words from the good or evil storehouse of the mind (or heart), he referred to the injurious language of those false teachers, the Pharisees, concerning himself and his works. §

For further remarks on this passage, and on the general character of St. Luke's reports of our Saviour's discourses, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. cxcix. – cci.

VII. 1–10. (The cure of the centurion's servant.)

Matthew and Luke did not here copy a common document, nor did Luke copy Matthew.

* Matthew xv. 14.

† Matthew vii. 3 – 5.

‡ Matthew vii. 16 – 18; see also xii. 33.

§ Matthew xii. 34, 35

5. "It was he who built our synagogue."

The mode of expression in the original implies that there was but one synagogue in Capernaum; and this, it appears, was built by a Roman centurion. Josephus (Vit. c. 72) speaks of the *town*, κώμη, not *city* of Capernaum. Compare τῆς συναγωγῆς, ch. viii. 41.

11. "Soon after, he was going to a town called Naïn."

The town of Naïn still exists under that name. It was fifteen or sixteen miles distant, in a straight line, from Capernaum, towards the southwest, lying near the southern side of Mount Tabor.

47. "Therefore I say to you, Her many sins have been forgiven; for she has loved much.* But he to whom little is forgiven loves little."

The conduct of the woman who anointed the feet of Jesus showed that she had been strongly affected by his character and preaching. She was manifesting her deep reverence and love for him, as a teacher of reformation and of hope. She felt shame and sorrow for her past life, and was prepared with her whole heart to be his disciple. Her sins were done away in the sight of God by her present affections and purposes. She was forgiven because she loved much. But Simon, who, it appears, was an unbelieving Pharisee, had the low and erro-

* Or perhaps this sentence should be rendered as follows:—"For this cause, I say to you, her many sins have been forgiven,—because she has loved much."

neous notions of duty common to his class ; he was insensible to the necessity of reformation for himself and others ; and consequently felt no gratitude to God for the means of moral improvement which he was affording, and no respect or affection for his minister.

In the discourse of Jesus there is a want of verbal adaptation between the parable and the application of it. In the former, love is represented as the consequence of the favor received ; in the latter, as the cause of obtaining favor. But it is with this as with other parables. We must not look for a literal counterpart, answering throughout to the figurative representation. The main purpose is alone to be regarded.

The whole force of the parable (which in this respect resembles the parable of the good Samaritan) consists in its implied bearing and indirect application. No other truth is directly brought into view by it, but that it is natural for men to feel gratitude in proportion to the benefits they have received. The implied inference might have been expressed by Jesus in these words : It is natural for men to feel gratitude for my religion in proportion to the benefit which they have received from it.

But in order to be benefited by it, they must have a sense of its value. They must feel gratitude and love for the new means afforded them of delivering themselves from sin, and of attaining moral purity, virtue, and happiness. Of such feelings reformation, and consequently the forgiveness of sin, were the natural result. When existing as strongly as they did in the poor woman who presented herself to our Lord, they showed that an essential change of character had already taken place. Her sins had been forgiven.

The blessings which God bestowed on men by Christianity were gratuitous favors, like those of a creditor who remits debts

which are due to him. They were favors to which neither men in general, nor the Jews in particular, had established any claim. This is another truth meant to be inculcated by the parable. But those blessings did not consist in the arbitrary remission of sins like the arbitrary cancelling of a debt. They consisted in the new light, the new motives, and the new impulses, through which God was acting on the minds of men to lead them to reformation and goodness. It was through a true estimate of these blessings that those affections were called forth which our Lord sums up under the name of love, and which were the necessary foundation of moral improvement and deliverance from sin. It is not to be supposed that the love which he intended was a feeling corresponding to that of a debtor to whom a creditor has remitted his claims; that is, a feeling arising merely from the belief of any one that he is not to be punished for the sins of which he has been guilty. The love intended by our Lord was essentially the love of goodness, leading to reformation and virtue, and thus to deliverance from sin and its consequences.

“But he to whom little is forgiven loves little.” This is one of the common modes of expression in which more is implied than is directly said. The meaning is: He to whom nothing is forgiven has no love. The words of Jesus are to this effect: He who under the influences and excitements of my religion has not reformed himself, and thus obtained the forgiveness of his sins, has no love of goodness. There is in these words a reference to Simon. It would be a strange misunderstanding of them to suppose that Jesus meant to say, that in proportion to the small number of any one’s sins, that is, in proportion to his moral excellence, he would feel less love to God for his

goodness displayed in Christianity. Yet in this sense only would they correspond verbally with the parable.

VIII. 3. “— who provided for his wants from what they possessed.”

Compare Mark vi. 8.

IX. 10. “He withdrew to an uninhabited place belonging to a city called Bethsaida.”

We may suspect that there is here an error in Luke's narrative. The place which is commonly, probably everywhere else, in the Gospels intended by the name Bethsaida, was a town on the western shore of the lake of Galilee, but a few miles distant from Capernaum. But we learn from the three other Evangelists that Jesus crossed the lake from Capernaum to its eastern shore.

On the eastern shore, or rather at the head of the lake, there was another place in Gaulonitis, in the dominions of Philip, which had formerly been called Bethsaida, and which probably in the time of our Lord was still so called by the common people. It had been built up by Philip into a city, and was named by him Julias, in honor of Julia, the daughter of Augustus. It is several times mentioned by Josephus (particularly *Antiq. Jud. Lib. XVIII. c. 2. § 1* ; *De Bell. Jud. Lib. III. c. 10. § 7*). This place likewise was but a short distance, not ten miles, from Capernaum (whichever may be thought the most probable site of that town), lying on the left or easterly bank of the Jordan where it entered the lake.

In order to conform Luke's account to those of the three other Evangelists, we must suppose that by Bethsaida he meant

the city of Julias, and by "an uninhabited place," some place, as one of the neighboring mountains, which was under the jurisdiction of the city. The latter circumstance, it would seem, could be referred to only for the purpose of marking its proximity to Julias or Bethsaida. But supposing the multitude to have been near the city, the Apostles would hardly have proposed to send them to the villages and the country round about to procure food.

It is also said by Luke, as well as by Matthew and Mark, that Jesus was followed by a multitude of men, who, according to Mark, travelled along the shore of the lake, coming together from different towns. But we have no knowledge that there was at Julias any bridge over the Jordan, without which that river must have presented an obstacle to their farther progress. If they had been following Jesus on foot from the western shore of the lake, the nearest bridge over the Jordan was that called Jacob's bridge, which still remains, somewhere about five or six miles north of the head of the lake. (See Robinson's Biblical Researches, Vol. III. p. 310, and his map.) It appears, moreover, from John (ch. vi. 22 – 25), that the multitude, on the morning after Jesus left them, did not set out on foot to seek for him at Capernaum, as we may suppose they would have done if they had come from that place and the neighboring country on the western shore, and had they been but a few miles distant from it, with no obstacle in the way; but that, in order to reach Capernaum, they took advantage of some boats which happened to arrive where they were.

We may conjecture, therefore, that Luke has here introduced the name of Bethsaida through mistake. If so, it is uncertain whether the Bethsaida which he had in mind was that of Gaulonitis or that of Galilee. Being probably ignorant of the

geography of Galilee and the neighboring country, it may even be doubted whether he was aware that there were two different places, on the lake of Galilee, to which the name of Bethsaida might be given, or was acquainted with the particular site of either of them. He may have been led into error by the fact, which Mark implies, that Jesus did arrive at Bethsaida in Galilee the day after miraculously feeding the five thousand.

“A city called Bethsaida”:—an expression adapted to Gentile, not Jewish readers.

18-27. (The disciples profess their faith in Jesus as the Messiah. He warns them of the sufferings and death which awaited himself, and for which they must be prepared as his followers.)

Matthew (ch. xvi. 13) and Mark (ch. viii. 27) say that this conversation took place when Jesus was on his way to Caesarea Philippi. Besides the miracle of feeding the five thousand, they give an account of another of a similar kind when four thousand were fed; after which they relate the conversation here given by Luke. Luke has preserved no account of the latter miracle, nor of the events recorded by Matthew (ch. xiv. 22, seqq.) and Mark (ch. vi. 45, seqq.) which occurred between the two. Thus, by the order of his narrative, the conversation here given is represented as standing in a relation to the first miracle in which it actually stood to the second.

33. “And as these were parting from Jesus, Peter said to him, Master, it is good for us to be

here. Let us make three tents, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah."

The fact that Moses and Elijah appeared as if about to depart explains the reason of Peter's speech. He expresses his desire that they should remain there. This explanatory circumstance is wanting in the other Evangelists.

43 - 45. Observe that what is here related occurred some time after what is mentioned immediately before. Compare Matthew xvii. 22, and Mark ix. 30 - 32. The same remark may be made on vv. 46 - 50. Compare the parallel passages.

IX. 51 - XVIII. 14. (The middle portion of Luke's Gospel.)

In order to have a right apprehension of this part of Luke's Gospel, we must attend to the following considerations.

The miracle of the feeding of the five thousand, which is related by all the Evangelists, is said by John (ch. vi. 4) to have taken place a little before a Passover, the second Passover, as I suppose, in our Lord's ministry.

From the time of this miracle the first three Evangelists agree in the order of the events which they relate in common, till they all come to the mention of our Lord's last departure from Galilee, with which this portion of Luke's Gospel commences.

From Galilee he went, according to Matthew (ch. xix. 1) and Mark (ch. x. 1), into the part of Judæa beyond the Jordan, that is, into Peræa.

His last departure from Galilee was, I suppose, upon the occasion of his going up to the Feast of Tabernacles, as mentioned by John (ch. vii. 10). This Feast of Tabernacles pre-

ceded by about six months the Passover at which he suffered. These six months included the four rainy months of winter, during which it is reasonable to suppose that his ministry must have been more or less interrupted.

But during the winter, as we learn from John (ch. x. 22, 23), he was at the Feast of Dedication (about the time of the winter solstice); and after attending this feast, "he *returned*," as John says (ch. x. 40), "beyond the Jordan," that is, into Peræa.

All the first three Evangelists represent him, on his last journey into Judæa, as proceeding by the way of Jericho; that is, as coming from the direction of Peræa.

I suppose, therefore, that Matthew and Mark, omitting to mention his short visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles, take notice only of the change of his place of residence from Galilee to Peræa; and that we may infer from the passages which have been remarked upon, that he continued to reside and journey in Peræa,—with the exception of his visit to the Feast of Dedication, and to Ephraim,—during the interval, of perhaps about five months, between the time of his arrival there after the Feast of Tabernacles, and that of his leaving the country to come to Bethany for the raising of Lazarus, a little before his last visit to Jerusalem.

After the mention of his final departure from Galilee, Matthew (ch. xix. 3–12) and Mark (ch. x. 2–12) give an account of a discourse with the Pharisees concerning divorce, not preserved by Luke; but they either give in other connections, or omit altogether, whatever is related by Luke in the part of his Gospel under consideration. At the conclusion of this discourse, they again coincide with him in the series of events, beginning with the account of the children who were brought to him for his blessing, apparently about the time of his leaving Peræa. (Matthew xix. 13 seqq.; Mark x. 13 seqq.; Luke

xviii. 15 seqq.) Then follows in all three Evangelists the narrative relating to the young man who came to inquire what he should do to have eternal life, and then in all three we find our Lord at Jericho on his last journey into Judæa.

Of the events intervening between our Lord's final departure from Galilee and his leaving Peræa for the last time, few appear to have been of such special interest as to have entered into that oral history which formed the basis of the teaching of the Apostles. Only three narratives, those just mentioned, are referred by Matthew and Mark to the interval between his leaving Galilee and his being at Jericho. But Luke between these two points in our Lord's ministry has interposed all that portion of his Gospel under consideration.

To explain his having done so, we may suppose that, on arriving in his narrative at the point of our Lord's departure from Galilee, he found that he was approaching the end of his history, and at the same time perceived that he had omitted many facts and discourses which made a part of the apostolical tradition concerning it. Of these, therefore, he formed a miscellaneous collection, which constitutes the portion of his Gospel under consideration. This, by way of distinction, may be called the middle portion of his Gospel. The first portion relates to events which he, in common with Matthew and Mark, represents as having occurred before our Lord took leave of Galilee. The last portion relates to the closing scenes of his ministry.

Luke, generally, throughout his Gospel, except in cases where there could be no mistake, shows himself to be ignorant of the chronological order of events, and often of the original connection and reference of discourses and sayings of our Lord.*

* See Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. p. cxvi, seqq. ; p. clxxx., seqq. ; and p. exciv, seqq.

His consequent disregard of chronology may explain why, in this middle portion of his Gospel, he has brought together many things which did not occur during the interval of time which he has apparently assigned for them. In this portion, likewise, the characteristics just mentioned are somewhat more striking than in the first part of his Gospel. In the latter part of it, they were excluded by the well-known sequence of the events related, and we find him coinciding in the order of these events with the other Evangelists.

In regard, however, to several of the facts or sayings mentioned in the middle portion of his Gospel, which are not related by the other Evangelists, they may, not improbably, have occurred, or been delivered, in the interval to which he has referred them ; that is, during the time between the commencement of our Lord's journey from Galilee and that of his leaving Peræa.

On the chronological arrangement of the events recorded by the Evangelists, see, further, Appendix, Note B.

55, 56. (Our Lord's reproof of James and John, when they proposed calling down fire from heaven on a village of Samaritans.)

“When our Lord and his disciples were refused hospitality by the Samaritans of a certain village, which was an act of peculiar disrespect according to the notions of that age and country, James and John, in common, doubtless, with the other disciples, were indignant at such treatment. They recollected what, according to the Jewish history, had been the dealings of prophets of old with those who offended them ; they were disposed, on this as on other occasions, to take the lead among the

disciples, and, under the excitement of the moment, they addressed Jesus with the question, — ‘Master, shall we call down fire from heaven and destroy them?’

“ ‘But he turned and rebuked them; [and said, You know not of what spirit you are. For the Son of Man came not to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.] And they went to another village.’

“ We can conceive of no words more appropriate to the occasion, more suitable to the character of our Lord, or better fitted to repress and correct the wrong feelings of his disciples. They conveyed a reproof full of instruction, expressed at once in the mildest and most effectual form.

“ One who is not a critical student of the New Testament may therefore be surprised to learn, that the words included in brackets were probably not in the Gospel of Luke as written by him. They are wanting in a large majority of the oldest and most important manuscripts.

.

“ In the passage before us, our Lord is represented as saying to two of the principal Apostles, ‘You know not of what spirit you are’; that is, as I doubt not that the words should be understood, ‘You know not the spirit of my religion’; and in his own conduct he presents the spirit of Christianity in contrast with what was conceived to be the spirit of Judaism, as exemplified in the story concerning Elijah. (See 2 Kings, ch. i.)

.

“ The omission of this passage in the copies in which it is not found cannot, as we have seen, be accounted for as having been caused either by accident or by design. We must conclude, therefore, that it did not make a part of the original text of Luke’s Gospel.

“But, on the other hand, the words carry with them strong intrinsic proof that they were spoken by Jesus. Nor can we imagine any reason why, if not uttered by him, they should have been invented and ascribed to him.

“In this state of the case, the only solution of the appearances that present themselves seems to be, that the words ascribed to our Lord were spoken by him, that they were preserved in the memories of those who heard him, and communicated by them to others, and that, not having been recorded by Luke, they were first written in the margin, and then introduced into the text of his Gospel.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. lxxx. — lxxxvii, where may be found a full discussion of the passage.

X. 4. “Salute no one on your way.”

That is, Do not stop to exchange greetings with any one. The forms of salutation in the East were ceremonious and long. The direction was symbolical, not meant to be literally complied with, but intended to impress those to whom it was given with a sense of the importance and urgency of their work.

6. “If one worthy of peace be there.”

Verbally, “a son of peace.” The reference is to the master of the house.

13 – 15. “Alas for thee, Chorazin! Alas for thee, Bethsaida!” &c.

This passage is apparently inserted out of place, in consequence of the relation of the ideas to those in the twelfth verse.

18, 19 “And he said to them, I saw Satan falling from heaven like lightning,” &c.

In this figurative language our Saviour meant to predict the triumph of his religion over moral evil. This the Jews conceived of as having its source in Satan. Conforming his language to their imaginations, he speaks of Satan as falling from heaven, that is, as losing the elevation and rule which they believed him to possess.

On our Saviour's use of language conformed to the conceptions of the Jews, see Appendix, Note D, pp. 512–518, and Note E, pp. 555–557.

With verse 19 compare Psalm xci. 13.

25. “And lo! a certain teacher of the Law came to try him.”

“— teacher of the Law,” *νομικός*. Matthew uses *γραμματεὺς* twenty-four times, Mark twenty-one, and Luke only fourteen; while, on the other hand, Luke uses *νομοδιδάσκαλος* once, which does not occur in the other Evangelists, and *νομικός* six times. The last term is not used by the other Evangelists except in the narrative contained in Matthew xxii. 34–40, which has so much resemblance to the present as to create a suspicion that it may have been founded on the same event.

Neither word is found in John's Gospel. But *γραμματεῖς* is a various reading in the passage respecting the woman taken in adultery.

40. “But Martha was busily occupied in serving.”

Observe the coincidence with John xii. 2 in the view given of Martha's character.

XI. 1. "One of his disciples said to him, Master, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples."

This passage affords one of the indirect proofs that the disciples of John remained a distinct body from those of Jesus.

5-8. "Suppose one of you should have a friend, and should go to him at midnight," &c.

In regard to the construction, see the note on Matthew xxiv 45, 46. Compare verse 11.

14.-XIII. 9. On this portion of Luke's Gospel, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. ccviii, ccix

24-26. See the note on Matthew xii. 45.

27, 28. "And while he was thus speaking, a woman called out from the crowd," &c.

Note the remarkable coincidence between what is here related and the narrative in Matthew xii. 46-50; and also the apparent want of connection with anything preceding in Luke.

33-36. "A lamp is not lighted to be hidden away," &c.

The connection of thought which led St. Luke here to introduce this passage, and the meaning which he put upon the words, may perhaps be thus explained. Though the preaching of Jesus had produced so little effect on those whom he immediately addressed, yet he was truly the light of the world, which it was the purpose of God should not be hidden from any. He had come to enlighten all. This is what is expressed in the

thirty-third verse. The figurative language respecting a lamp is then continued, but with an essential change of its meaning, the expressions, probably, not having been used by our Saviour himself in connection with those preceding. (See Matthew vi. 22, 23.)

“The lamp of your body is your eye.” This and all that follows is obviously metaphorical, relating not to the body, but to the mind. Reason, the eye or lamp of the mind, is compared to the natural eye conceived of as admitting light into the body.* If reason, the intellect, be not darkened by prejudice or sin, the soul will be enlightened. It will admit the light coming from Jesus. If it be otherwise, the soul will be in darkness. But “if the whole body be enlightened,” if one be entirely free from all that may pervert his judgment, the light he will enjoy will be splendid indeed.

37. “And after he had been teaching, a Pharisee asked him to dine with him.”

“And after he had been teaching.” It is evidently the purpose of Luke, in the portion of this chapter beginning with the fourteenth verse and ending with the thirty-sixth, to report the

* Philo calls the intellect *ὁ φαινόμενος λαμπρὸς νοῦς ἐν ἡμῖν*. (Legg. Allegorr. Lib. III. Opp. I. 94. Elsewhere he says, ‘*Ἡ δὲ διὰ τοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡγεμονικοῦ [ὄρασις] προφέρει τὰς ἄλλας, ὅσαι αἱ περὶ αὐτὴν δυνάμεις. Αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶ φρόνησις, ὅψις οὖσα διανοίας*. (De Abrahamo. II. 9, 10.) “*Ὅπερ γὰρ νοῦς ἐν ψυχῇ, τοῦτο ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν σώματι*. (De Mundi Opificio. I. 12.) Clement of Alexandria says, ‘*Ἡ σύνεσις ὅψις ἐστὶ ψυχῆς*. Opp. p. 144, l. 4. Again, *Τὸ δὲ ἴδιον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ὄμμα τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκκαθαίρειν*, p. 162, l. 16. ‘*Ὡς* (l. *ὁ* vel *ὅπερ*, Sylburg.) *γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν σώματι, τοῦτο ἐν τῷ νῷ ἡ γνῶσις*, p. 531, l. 29. [See also Wetstein’s note on Matthew vi. 22.]

same discourse which is given in the twelfth chapter of Matthew, vv. 22–45. But the character of this discourse as recorded by Matthew is such as to render it improbable that a Pharisee would have invited Jesus to his house immediately after its delivery. Matthew (ch. xiii. 1), without taking any notice of such an invitation, says that, subsequently to the delivery of the discourse, on “the same day, Jesus went out from *the* house” (or, “from his house”),—that is, from the house where he was staying at Capernaum,—and repaired to the shore of the lake, where a great multitude collected round him, whom he taught in parables; that, after his discourse to the multitude, he “returned to the house” (verse 36), where he explained the parables to his disciples, and then, having finished these parables, he departed thence (verse 53), that is, from Capernaum. The account of Matthew appears altogether inconsistent with the supposition that he dined and held an earnest conversation the same day in the house of a Pharisee.

But perhaps the words of Luke in making a transition to the narrative commencing with the twenty-seventh verse, Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι, — which are rendered in the Common Version, “And as he spake,” and which have been commonly understood in a like manner,—are not to be taken in so restricted a sense, as referring to the discourse of Jesus immediately before mentioned, but are to be understood as used indefinitely, so as to mean, “At some time when he was teaching.”

The discourse delivered by the shore of the lake near Capernaum, consisting of parables, is given by Mark (ch. iv. 1–33) in the same connection in which it stands in Matthew. It evinces Luke’s ignorance of the order and relation of events, that he gives a partial report of it in a connection altogether different (ch. viii. 4–18).

39 – 52. (Denunciations against the Pharisees and the teachers of the Law.)

“In one instance, a portion of the Sermon on the Mount, we have found a discourse of Jesus referred by Luke to an occasion on which it was not delivered.” (See the note on Luke vi. 12 – 49.) “Another striking example of the same kind occurs, I believe, in the discourse consisting of a series of denunciations against the Pharisees. This has the appearance of having been one of the last and most solemn acts of the ministry of Jesus. It is represented by Matthew as having been delivered by him at Jerusalem, only two days before his death, in the temple, which he had then entered for the last time, amid a concourse of people, among whom many of the Pharisees were standing as listeners.

“All, according to the narrative of Matthew, is consistent. But Luke represents this discourse against the Pharisees as having been uttered somewhere at a distance from Jerusalem, in a private house, — the house of a Pharisee, who had, at least with a show of hospitality, invited Jesus as a guest. The occasion, likewise, assigned by Luke, does not seem such as the discourse required. The misplacing of this discourse by Luke may be accounted for by the supposition, that Jesus did, on the occasion to which this Evangelist has referred it, make some comments on the superstitious observances of the Pharisees, and speak of their worthlessness, contrasting it with the importance of justice, mercy, and truth.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. ccvi. – ccviii.

See also the note on Matthew xxiii. 37 – 39.

39. “Now you Pharisees make clean your cups

and dishes ; but you are full within of rapacity and wickedness.”

According to Matthew (ch. xxiii. 25), our Saviour said that the cups and dishes were full of wickedness. Luke represents him as saying that the Pharisees were full of wickedness. It seems probable that he expressed himself in the bold figure reported by Matthew, referring immediately to the ceremonial washing of the vessels spoken of, rather than in the literal language, having no reference to that subject, which is given by Luke. Together with this change, Luke introduces a new thought in verse 41, — “ But give what they hold as alms, and lo ! all will be clean to you,” — which could not so well stand in its present connection, if the figure were retained.

43. “ Woe for you, Pharisees ! for you love the highest seats in the synagogues, and salutations in the public places.”

What is here said is given by Matthew (ch. xxiii. 6), evidently with more correctness, simply as part of a description of the character of the Pharisees. In Matthew it is thus found in an appropriate connection. We should not expect that the love of distinction, considered in itself, would be selected by Jesus as a special subject of denunciation against the Pharisees, according to Luke’s representation.

44. “ Woe for you ! for you are like hidden graves, which men walk over without knowing where they are.”

The figure in this passage refers merely to the success of the Pharisees in *concealing* their vices. The more expressive

figure in Matthew (xxiii. 27, 28) describes them as imposing upon others by a show of sanctity. We might doubt which of these was substituted for the other, if we had not good reason for believing that Matthew, in all that relates to this conversation, is more to be relied on than Luke.

45. "Then one of the teachers of the Law said to him, Teacher, in saying these things, you are reviling even us."

That is, You are reviling even the authentic expositors of the religion of God. — The teachers of the Law were, for the most part, Pharisees, but all Pharisees were not teachers of the Law. This interruption is not mentioned by Matthew, and from his account there would appear to be some incorrectness in the narrative of Luke. According to Matthew, our Saviour directed his discourse, from its commencement, equally against the teachers of the Law and the Pharisees. Still, when this discourse was actually delivered in the Jewish temple, as Matthew informs us that it was, there may have been some interruption similar to that reported by Luke, which, in the process of oral tradition, gave occasion to the representation he has adopted.

47, 48. "Woe for you! for you are preparing the graves of the teachers from God, and your fathers slew them," &c.

Though this passage in Luke begins in the same manner as the corresponding passage in Matthew (xxiii. 29 – 31), and is evidently founded on the same words of our Saviour, yet I suppose that the meaning and turn of thought are different

in Luke from what, according to Matthew, our Saviour expressed.

The words of Luke suggest no such meaning as appears in those given by Matthew, nor would any one, except for the parallelism of the passages, think of giving them that meaning. On the contrary, they present another obvious and suitable sense which connects them immediately with what follows them. It may be thus stated: "You are preparing the graves" (or, "You are constructing the tombs") "of the teachers from God," — for this is the meaning of the word which in the Common Version is rendered "prophets," — that is, You are plotting their destruction. "And your fathers slew them"; — that is, Your fathers slew the teachers from God. The meaning of the forty-seventh verse being thus understood, what follows relating to the same subject needs no explanation.

The strong, poetical language of these verses may be illustrated by the following passages:—

"To entail him and his heirs unto the crown,
What is it but to make thy sepulchre?"

Shakespeare, King Henry VI. Part III. Act I Sc. I

"The wrinkles in my brows
Were likened oft to kingly sepulchres;
For who lived king, but I could dig his grave?"

Ibid., Act. V. Sc. II

49. "Thus, then, the wisdom of God has said."

That is, God in his wisdom has determined.

52. "Woe for you, teachers of the Law! for you have taken away the key of knowledge; you

enter not yourselves, and you keep out those who would enter."

After the strong denunciations which immediately precede it is evident that the tone of feeling is unnaturally lowered in this verse. It does not form a suitable conclusion to the discourse, but presents a striking contrast to the very appropriate and solemn ending given by Matthew (ch. xxiii. 37 - 39). It thus further illustrates the character of Luke's whole report.

53, 54. "And while he was thus speaking against them, the teachers of the Law and the Pharisees began vehemently to press him with questions about many things, endeavoring to ensnare him."

If we suppose, as has been suggested, that Luke's misplacing of the preceding discourse was occasioned by the fact that our Saviour, while in the house of the Pharisee with whom Luke informs us he had been invited to dine, actually remarked upon and reprov'd the superstitious observances of the Pharisees, we may readily believe that he was afterwards pressed with questions to ensnare him. But under the circumstances which Matthew describes as attending the discourse reported in common by him and Luke, such questions could not have followed it.

XII. 1 - 12. "While these things were taking place, and a vast multitude was gathering about him, so that men trod one upon another, he said to his disciples," &c.

By 'Εν οἷς in the first verse, rendered "In the mean time" in

the Common Version, and in a similar manner by other translators, it is not probable that Luke meant to refer to the events mentioned by him immediately before, but to the series of events which he conceived of as taking place about this time, and during which great multitudes gathered about Jesus.

The sayings of our Lord here reported by Luke are so obviously addressed to his immediate disciples as to make it evident that the Evangelist could not have regarded them as addressed to a promiscuous multitude. The narrative which he had just given led him to bring together in the present passage declarations of Jesus relating, or which he regarded as relating, to the character of the Pharisees, to the persecution which his disciples would suffer from them, and to the considerations by which they should be supported under these persecutions.

As we are not to suppose that the words of our Lord in the first twelve verses were addressed to a multitude that assembled about him on his leaving the Pharisee's house, so neither are we to suppose that their delivery was followed by the incident next related (vv. 13, 14). This chapter is not one connected discourse. It consists of a series of sayings and discourses of our Lord delivered at different times. They are arranged one after another, sometimes because they relate to the same subject, or because the thoughts expressed in one brought to mind those presented in another. See *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. ccviii, ccix.

1–5. “He said to his disciples, Above all things keep yourselves from the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. For everything

covered will be laid open, and everything concealed made known. What you have spoken in darkness will be heard in the light," &c.

"The first part of this passage, it is evident from the terms of expression, and from its connection with what follows, was intended to be a report of the same words of Jesus which are given by Matthew" (ch. x. 26-28). But in his Gospel, "when it is said, 'For there is nothing covered which is not to be unveiled,' the meaning [of Jesus] is, that there were no secrets in his religion. It was to be fully proclaimed. Nothing was to be kept concealed through fear of men. Thus Mark, after relating the parable of the sower, and its explanation to the disciples, represents our Lord as saying,* 'Does the lamp come to be put under the measure or the bench, and not to be set on its stand? Nothing is hidden but that it may be made known, nor was anything concealed but that it might be brought to light'; which words are, I think, to be understood thus:—I have not come to keep back the truths of religion, but to reveal them. There is nothing in my discourses intended to hide them, there was nothing intended to conceal them in the parable you have just heard; on the contrary, my modes of speaking are adopted, because they are most likely effectually to impress these truths upon the minds of such hearers as I address."

"There seems no ground for doubt that the true sense and proper bearing of the words in question appear in Matthew; but if this be so, their meaning was misapprehended by Luke.

* Mark iv. 21, 22.—Luke (ch. viii. 16-18) has one passage similar to this.

This may have arisen from the circumstance, that these striking words had, previously to the composition of his Gospel, been sometimes separated from their original connection, and applied to the subject of hypocrisy, to which they so well admit of being accommodated." — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. cxcv, cxvi.

"What you have spoken in darkness will be heard in the light," Ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἶπατε, κ. τ. λ. — Ἀνθ' ὧν, 'because,' 'for.' See the notes of Grotius on this passage, and on ch. i. 20. I cannot assent to his opinion that it here means *idcirco, propter hoc*, 'hence,' 'wherefore.' But to render this connecting term is unnecessary, and would only injure the expression in English.

10. "And though he who speaks against the Son of Man may be forgiven, yet he who utters calumnies against the Spirit of God will not be forgiven."

The declaration in this verse, which is given by Matthew (ch. xii. 32) and by Mark (ch. iii. 28, 29) in a very different connection, is here wholly out of place. The words which precede it and follow it were evidently addressed by our Saviour to his immediate disciples. They might be warned against the sin of being driven by persecution to deny their Master before men, but to them it would have been wholly inappropriate to address, in immediate connection, a denunciation of a sin to be committed by his bitterest enemies only, — that of reviling the power and goodness of God displayed in his religion. The words were perhaps here introduced by Luke to qualify and explain those which immediately precede, that it should not be

thought that his case was hopeless who might have denied Christ.

15. "And he said to them, Take care to keep yourselves from all covetousness."

"And he said to *them*." Here, as often in the New Testament, the demonstrative pronoun in Greek, or rather the personal pronoun of the third person, is used indefinitely. The subject which it denotes is to be supplied by the reader;—as, in the present case, "He said to his hearers," or, "to those about him." See the note on Matthew viii. 4.

24. "Consider the ravens; they neither sow nor reap, they have no granaries nor storehouses, yet God feeds them."

In Matthew (ch. vi. 26), there seems to be a reference to birds flying in sight; here, an allusion to Job xxxviii. 41, or Psalm cxlvii. 9.

35-48. (Jesus exhorts his disciples to watchfulness and fidelity.)

In this passage Jesus exhorts his followers to constant and watchful fidelity in the discharge of their duties, with reference to the hour when, in figurative language, he should come to examine into their conduct, and reward or punish them accordingly. By this expression is meant the time when the condition of men shall be determined, conformably to the laws of God's moral government promulgated by Christ. It is the period when, the labors and the discipline of this life being ended, the consequences of our good or evil deeds will be more fully developed in the future world.

But the Apostles had very imperfect conceptions of what Christ meant by his *coming*, in the different senses in which he used that term. At the same time, they thought themselves secure of his favor, as his peculiar and chosen followers, as the most zealous adherents to his yet doubtful cause. Peter, especially, had been particularly distinguished by him; and, from this circumstance and from his own character, had already begun to take that lead among the Apostles which he afterward maintained. When, therefore, Jesus represented the blessings to be enjoyed at his coming as conditional upon the future conduct of his followers, Peter asks in effect, Do you say this to us? Or do you even say it to your followers in general? Have we, or have they, anything but good to expect at your coming? * — To the false notions and presumption implied in this question, Jesus replies, with grave and humbling severity, that even the disciple whom his master might intrust with the highest charge — and this is said with especial reference to Peter himself — would be called to a strict account for his conduct, and rewarded or punished as he had been faithful or unfaithful; that the distinctions of such a disciple, being only

* Verse 41. "Then Peter said to him, Master, do you speak this parable to us, or even to all?"

I do not know how the occasion and purpose of the question of Peter can be explained, if it be understood, as it usually has been, to mean: Do you say this to us alone, or to all? — Nor can I perceive any appropriateness in the words of Christ, if conceived of as consequent upon such a question. Obviously, they cannot be regarded as an answer to it.

The phrase *ἢ καί*, "or even," is used, in this and similar cases, to denote that the proposition which follows is coincident in purpose with that which precedes, but is intended to bring out its meaning

means of rendering peculiar service to the cause of God, involved corresponding obligations of equal extent, and that from every one to whom much had been given, much would be required. The terrific images descriptive of the punishment that might be incurred appear to have been used to subdue and fix the unsettled character of Peter, who still wanted the self-denying and resolute principles required in an Apostle, as was subsequently shown in his denial of his Master.

There is something very striking in the calm and immeasurable superiority displayed by Jesus in this reply, and in his thus presenting himself separated from his disciples, wholly unsupported by any human sympathy. The tone of mind exhibited is such as could have existed only in a teacher from God. The same character equally appears in his putting aside all claims which his followers founded upon their zeal as his partisans, or their particular connection with him, and placing before them in such naked distinctness the only means of obtaining the blessings he offered, — the performance of the duties assigned to them by God.

The consistency and mutual relevancy of the thoughts throughout the whole passage in Luke show that he has given

with greater distinctness, to strengthen its force, or to add a new thought of the same kind. Thus we find it used in Luke xviii. 11: "I thank thee that I am not like the rest of men, *or even* like this very tax-gatherer." Romans xiv. 10: "Thou, then, why dost thou condemn thy brother? *Or even* thou, why dost thou despise thy brother?" 1 Corinthians xvi. 6: "Perhaps I shall spend some time with you, *or even* pass the winter." The other examples of the use of *ἢ καί* in the New Testament are the following: Luke xi. 11, 12; Romans ii. 15; iv. 9; 1 Corinthians ix. 8; 2 Corinthians i. 13. Perhaps all of these are to be explained in a similar manner.

the words of Jesus in their true connection and bearing, and confirm the remarks before made upon the passage as it stands in Matthew (xxiv. 42 - 51).

Note the transposition of thought in verses 35 - 40, as compared with Matthew.

54 - 59. (Jesus reproaches the Jews for their blindness to the character of the times, and warns them of the punishment to which they are exposed.)

The language ascribed to our Lord by Luke in vv. 54 - 56 corresponds to that which Matthew (ch. xvi. 2 - 4) represents him as having used in reply to the demand of the Pharisees and Sadducees for a sign from heaven. We cannot doubt that it was uttered on the occasion assigned by Matthew, and it is such language as does not seem likely to have been uttered except on some special occasion. But none is mentioned by Luke. On the contrary, by retaining the word "hypocrites," which was properly applied to the Pharisees and Sadducees, but which it is altogether improbable that Jesus would have applied indiscriminately to a large body of hearers collected around him, he shows that his report was founded on the same conversation which Matthew records.

The fifty-eighth and fifty-ninth verses in this passage correspond to words which occur in Matthew's report of the Sermon on the Mount (ch. v. 25, 26). But in Luke they appear in quite another connection, and with a different meaning.

"Here our Saviour is represented as reproaching the bigoted Jews for their blindness to the character of the times, by which

is meant, to those proofs of a divine interposition that his ministry was continually affording. Even if these proofs were less striking, they might judge from themselves what it was right for them to do; which was to secure the favor of God, and to obtain from him pardon of their sins by reformation. Otherwise, they would be acting as one who should make no effort to propitiate his creditor (as he might do); and who, in consequence, should be condemned to imprisonment till the full amount of his debt was paid; that is, they would remain exposed to the full punishment of their sins. The figurative language here used is illustrated by that of the parable * concerning the servant, to whom his master first forgave a debt, and afterward enforced its payment, on account of the cruelty of that servant toward one of his fellows. ‘And his master, being angry with him, delivered him over to the executioners of the law, till he should pay all that he owed.’

“It is true, that Jesus may have used the same, or similar, words and figures in different senses on different occasions. But, as regards this passage in Luke, there is not merely the fact, that the words are found in Matthew with another connection and meaning; but the obscurity of the passage itself, the want of obvious adaptation of one part to another, and the difficulty in discovering the relations of the ideas, serve to show, that expressions have been brought together which were not originally connected.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxcviii.

Compare the note on Matthew v. 23 – 26.

XIII. 1. “About the same time there came to

* Matthew xviii. 23 – 35.

him some who told him of the Galilæans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices."

The events spoken of in this and the fourth verse were probably of little historical importance, and are not mentioned by Josephus. But we learn from that author that the Galilæans were distinguished from the other Jews by their greater disposition to sedition and turbulence. Tumults were very likely to take place at the public festivals in Jerusalem. Josephus mentions several instances of them, and many doubtless occurred of which we have no record. Some time about thirty years before this discourse of our Lord, Archelaus, according to Josephus (*Antiq. Jud. Lib. XVII. c. 9*), massacred a large number of seditious Jews, who seem to have been principally Galilæans, in the temple, at the Feast of the Passover. This account in Josephus is soon after (*c. 10*) followed by another of a similar massacre at the Feast of Pentecost, under the orders of Sabinus, the Roman procurator.

2. "Do you think, because they suffered thus that those Galilæans were greater sinners than all the other Galilæans?"

The Jews, as is here implied, regarded temporal calamities as divine punishments. See Kuinoel on Matthew ix. 1, and Schoettgen on John ix. 2.

See also, in relation to this passage, Appendix. Note E, p. 550

6 – 9. (The parable of the barren fig-tree.)

In the "Proceedings of the Expedition to explore the Northern Coast of Africa," by Captain F. W. Beechey and H. W. Beechey, the following is part of a note (pp. 343, 344).

“When a palm-tree refuses to bear, (says the Arab author of a treatise on agriculture,) the owner of it, armed with a hatchet, comes to visit it in company with another person. He then begins by observing aloud to his friend, (in order that the date-tree should hear him,) ‘I am going to cut down this worthless tree, since it no longer bears me any fruit.’ ‘Have a care what you do, brother,’ returns his companion; ‘I should advise you to do no such thing, for I will venture to predict that this very year your tree will be covered with fruit.’ ‘No, no,’ replies the owner, ‘I am determined to cut it down, for I am certain it will produce me nothing’; and then, approaching the tree, he proceeds to give it two or three strokes with his hatchet. ‘Pray now, I entreat you, desist,’ says the mediator, holding back the arm of the proprietor; ‘do but observe what a fine tree it is, and have patience for this one season more; should it fail after that to bear you any fruit, you may do with it just what you please.’ The owner of the tree then allows himself to be persuaded, and retires without proceeding to any further extremities. But the threat and the few strokes inflicted with the hatchet have always, it is said, the desired effect, and the terrified palm-tree produces the same year a most abundant supply of fine dates. (Extract from Kazwini, *Chrestomathie Arabe*, Tom. III. p. 319.)” See the story related in Rosenmüller’s *Morgenland*, V. 186, seqq. See also *Monthly Review*, Vol. LI. for 1806, p. 187.

10-17. (The cure of an infirm woman in a synagogue on the Sabbath.)

Nothing can be more natural than the oblique manner in which the ruler of the synagogue is here represented as expressing his displeasure. Too much awed by the miracle to address

our Saviour himself, he vents his ill-feeling on the people. We find also another mark of truth and genuineness in the expression used by our Lord, "daughter of Abraham," the Jews thinking themselves entitled to particular consideration and favor, as descendants of Abraham.

18-21. (Comparison of the kingdom of God to a mustard seed and to leaven.)

Luke may have been led to introduce these declarations in this place in consequence of their indirect relation to what precedes. The passages from ch. xii. 49 to ch. xiii. 9 bring to view the opposition and almost universal incredulity that Jesus had to encounter, while the narrative immediately succeeding these passages (vv. 10-17) affords an example of his deeds and words having produced their appropriate effect.

22. "And he was going through the towns and villages, teaching, on his way to Jerusalem."

The towns and villages of Peræa are probably intended. Compare verse 31.

23-30. (The answer of Jesus to the question, "Will but few be saved?")

Though in this passage the answer of Jesus corresponds in its language with words, which, according to Matthew, he used at different times on other occasions,* yet this alone affords no ground for questioning the correctness of Luke's report. There

* With verse 24, compare Matthew vii. 13, 14;—with vv. 25-27, Matthew vii. 22, 23, and xxv. 10-12;—with vv. 28, 29, Matthew viii. 11, 12;—and with verse 30, Matthew xix. 30; xx. 16.

can be no reason to doubt that our Lord expressed on different occasions the same or like thoughts in the same or similar words. In the present case the answer is throughout suitable to the question proposed.

The question, “Will but few be saved?” apparently had its origin in the warnings and denunciations of our Lord, which were applicable to far the greater part of the Jews. The Jews had looked for the coming of the Messiah as a universal benefit to the nation, an event through which they were to be delivered from the evils they were suffering, and to receive new distinctions and blessings. When these expectations were contrasted with the words of Jesus, the question now proposed to him was at once suggested to their minds. We do not know in what spirit it was really asked, but we cannot doubt that the feelings of many were such, that they might have expressed them by saying, Do you claim to be the Messiah, and do you pretend that but few of God’s chosen people will be saved? — that is, that but few of them will enjoy the blessings of the Messiah’s kingdom?

24. “For many, I say to you, will desire to enter, and will not be able.”

That is, Many will earnestly desire the felicity spoken of, when it is too late to obtain it; or, thus desiring it, they will not take the proper means to obtain it.

30. “There are those who are last, who will be first; and those who are first, who will be last.”

By the “first” and the “last” are here meant the Jews and the Gentiles, — those who had stood highest and those who had stood lowest as regards religious distinctions and privileges.

31. "The same day, certain Pharisees came to him and said, Go away, and depart hence; for Herod designs to kill you."

It seems probable that these Pharisees were actually sent by Herod to endeavor to terrify our Saviour, so as to induce him to leave his dominions. See Wetstein and Kuinoel.

34, 35. "Jerusalem! Jerusalem! who killest the teachers from God," &c.

It is evident that these words were not uttered in this connection. In Matthew, they form a most striking conclusion of our Lord's last discourse in the temple, but here they are out of place. See the note on Matthew xxiii. 37 – 39, and compare Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. p. ccvi, seqq.

XIV. 1. "And he entered the house of a ruler who was a Pharisee, to eat, on the Sabbath."

It is not probable that, after the denunciations recorded in the eleventh chapter (vv. 39 – 52), Jesus would have been invited to a Pharisee's house. See the note on that passage.

The Jews were accustomed to give entertainments on the Sabbath. See Lightfoot and Wetstein.

5. "Is there any one of you, who, if his son or his ox should fall into a pit on the Sabbath-day, would not immediately draw him out?"

"— his *son* or his ox." The external evidence preponderates much in favor of the reading *υἱός*, *son*, over *ὄνος*, *ass*. That it is the true reading appears also from the fact, that it presents

what seems, at first view, a strange combination, which no transcriber would substitute for what appears the more obvious and natural one, "his ass or his ox," which has occurred a little before (ch. xiii. 15). On the contrary, a transcriber would be very likely to adopt the latter reading instead of the former, which he might readily suppose to be an error. It may be observed further, that where an ox and an ass are mentioned together, as is often the case in the Old and New Testaments, the ox is always elsewhere mentioned first, I suppose as being the more valuable animal.

By "his son or his ox," we must understand "his son or even his ox." The change of expression from what Jesus at other times used in proposing a similar question was probably occasioned by some particular circumstance. The Pharisees, we may suppose, looked with contempt on the poor diseased object before them, and the purpose of our Lord may have been to teach them that he was as little to be contemned as one of their own sons. This indirect statement of his claim to consideration and kindness would correspond to our Lord's calling the woman whom he healed in a synagogue "a daughter of Abraham." (Ch. xiii. 16.)

7-11. "And when he observed how those who had been invited chose out the highest places at table, he spoke a parable to them," &c.

The words of Jesus here given are, perhaps, to be understood as a proper parable, in which one thing is illustrated by comparison with another, not as a mere prudential direction concerning the conduct to be observed at an entertainment. The blessings of the kingdom of Heaven are often expressed under the figure of an entertainment, as in the verses following (15-

24). In the words here given, Jesus may have referred to the claim which the Pharisees made of being entitled to those blessings, or, in other words, to their claiming a right to the first seats at the table in the kingdom of Heaven. At the time when the words were delivered, circumstances may have rendered their application more obvious than it now appears in the narration. I doubt whether a plain precept expressed in literal language was ever called a "parable."

See Tracts concerning Christianity, p. 306.

12. "And he said also to him who had invited him, When you make a dinner or a supper, do not invite your friends, nor your brothers, nor your relations, nor your rich neighbors; lest they invite you in turn, and you be repaid."

Compare Plato, *Phædr.* c. 19, p. 233: *Καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις δαπάναις οὐ τοὺς φίλους ἄξιον παρακαλεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς προσαιτοῦντας καὶ τοὺς δεομένους πλησμονῆς· ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ καὶ ἀγαπήσουσι καὶ ἀκολουθήσουσι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας ἤξουσι καὶ μάλιστα ἡσθήσονται καὶ οὐκ ἐλαχίστην χάριν εἶσονται καὶ πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτοῖς εὔξονται.* ["And besides this, in private entertainments it will not be proper to invite our friends, but mendicants and those who are in need of a hearty meal; for these will greet and follow us, and will come to our doors, and be highly delighted, and feel the utmost gratitude, and pray for many blessings upon us." — Caryl's Translation.]

The resemblance of the precept, and the difference of the motives by which it is enforced, are striking. The passage from Plato serves likewise to show the correspondence between our Saviour's direction and the customs of ancient times.

13. “But when you make an entertainment, invite the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind,” &c.

The literal observance of this precept is not binding upon Christians at the present day. In ancient times there was no public provision for the support and comfort of the poor. There were no almshouses or hospitals; there were no societies of men united for benevolent purposes. Everything was left to the private charity of unconnected individuals. Hospitality, and the distributing of provisions to the poor at the houses of the liberal, were among the principal modes in which charity was exercised throughout the East. The state of society and of manners, however, has changed, and there are now other methods of relieving the wants of the necessitous, equally effectual, and more convenient both to the giver and to the receiver, than that of entertaining them in one's own house. The precept, therefore, is no longer obligatory upon us, as it respects the manner in which our charity shall be administered. But it remains in full force, as it respects the duty itself. It teaches us, that attention to the necessities of the lower classes in society is an essential duty of a Christian who has the means of affording relief. — *MS. Lectures.*

23. “Go out into the highways and among the inclosures without the city, and constrain whom you find to come in.”

This passage affords an example of the importance which has been attached to a single misinterpreted word. It was formerly used as a main argument for religious persecution. Bayle's treatise on toleration, almost the first that taught its true prin-

ciples, is entitled *Commentaire Philosophique sur ces Paroles de Jésus-Christ, Contrain-les d'entrer*.

It hardly needs to be remarked, that the Greek word ἀναγκάζω, here as often elsewhere, implies no exertion of physical force. The meaning is simply, Earnestly persuade and press them to come. The reference is to the preaching of Christianity to the Gentiles, after its rejection by the Jews. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

26. “No one who comes to me can be my disciple, unless he hate his father, and mother,” &c.

“Unless he hate his father and mother.” “The genius of our language hardly admits of so bold a figure, by which, however, nothing more was signified, than that the followers of Christ must be prepared to sacrifice their dearest affections in his cause.” — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 95.

27. “And whoever does not follow me, bearing his cross, cannot be my disciple.”

See the note on Matthew xvi. 24.

34, 35. “Salt is good ; but if salt lose its savor, with what can it be salted ?” &c.

I think, with Schleiermacher, that these verses are well connected with what precedes. — You desire to become my disciples. My disciples are the salt of the earth. Take care, if you profess my religion, that you do not become disheartened and fall away. You will be like salt that has lost its savor.

XV. 7. “I tell you, that thus there is joy in heaven over one sinner who reforms, more than

over ninety-nine righteous men who have no need of reformation.”

The expressions in this verse are highly figurative, addressed to the imagination alone, and incapable of being translated into literal language ; but they were adapted strongly to impress on the mind of a hearer or reader in the times of our Lord the desirableness in the sight of God, and of all good beings, of the conversion of a sinner.

The same parable which we here find in Luke (vv. 3–7) is given by Matthew (ch. xviii. 12–14) in another connection. This alone affords no sufficient ground for believing that it may not have been uttered by our Lord in the connection in which it stands in Luke.

But it may be observed, that Matthew has not the expressions just remarked upon, which belong to the strong and loose modes of speech adapted only to uncultivated hearers like the Jews. Matthew simply represents our Lord as saying in reference to *the owner of the sheep*, “And if he find it, he rejoices more over it than over the ninety-nine which had not strayed.” Jesus may, on another occasion, have used the words ascribed to him by Luke, or these words may be an interpretation of those given by Matthew, made by a reporter of our Lord’s parable, and expressing the conceptions which he derived from them.

11 – 32. (The parable of the prodigal son.)

The parable contained in these verses corresponds in its purpose with the preceding discourse of our Lord, being meant, like that, to urge to reformation from sin, and to illustrate the readiness (if we may so speak) of God to receive to his mercy a sinner who reforms.

The introduction into the parable of the elder son tends to bring out more strongly the representation of the mercy of God. The common Father of all forgives his erring child, when man has not compassion on his erring brother.

With this there may have been another purpose. The elder brother had "served his father for many years, and never disobeyed his commands, and all that his father had was his." In his character, our Lord may have meant to illustrate the truth, that those who have been free from blame themselves may be led by this very circumstance to feel uncharitably toward such as have fallen when exposed to temptation.

But his principal object appears to have been to rebuke that spiritual pride and moral obliquity which leads men to look upon those degraded by their vices only as objects of aversion and contempt, unworthy of the care of God or of the good offices of their fellow-men. The enemies of Jesus represented him as sharing in the debasement of tax-gatherers and sinners when he associated with them for the purpose of their reformation.

16. "And he longed to fill himself with the pods that the swine ate; but no one gave him any."

We are to conceive that the pods were given to the swine in addition to the food which they found in the fields; and not by the prodigal, but by some other person.

The pods of the Carob-tree, or St. John's Bread, *Ceratonia siliqua*, are probably the fruit here referred to. [See Robinson's Biblical Researches, III. 58, note.]

XVI. 6. "And he said, A hundred measures of oil."

The *βάρος*, *bath*, here translated "measure," contained, ac-

according to Josephus (Antiq. Jud. Lib. VIII. c. 2. § 9), seventy-two Attic *sextarii*. The *sextarius* being about equal to a pint, exceeding it, according to Arbuthnot, only by .48 cubic inch, the *bath* would contain about nine gallons. Cumberland, however, computes its contents as only a little more than seven gallons and a half.

7. “And he said, A hundred measures of wheat.”

“A hundred measures of wheat,” ἑκατὸν κόρους σίτου. The *κόρος*, *cor*, or *homer*, Josephus (Antiq. Jud. Lib. XV. c. 9. § 2) says, was equal to ten Attic *medimni*. The *medimnus* was equal to a bushel, six pints, and 3.501 cubic inches, according to Arbuthnot. But Cumberland computes the *κόρος* as equal to about eight bushels.

9. “And I say to you, Do you make yourselves such friends, by riches falsely so called, as, when you leave this life, may welcome you to the eternal dwellings.”

“—by riches falsely so called,” ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, equivalent to ἐκ τοῦ ἀδίκου μαμωνᾶ, as appears in the eleventh verse. In that verse the meaning of *ἄδικος* is determined by its opposition to *ἀληθινός*. Ἀδικία and *ἄδικος* are not uncommonly used in the sense of “falsehood” and “false.” See Schleusner’s Lexicons of the New Testament and of the Septuagint; Wetstein’s note; and Valckenarii Scholæ.

The meaning is, By the right use of earthly, perishable riches, make God your friend.

12. “And if you have not been faithful in what belongs to another, who will give you anything for your own?”

“— what belongs to another”:— that is, the wealth intrusted to you by God in this world, and which you receive as stewards. “— anything for your own”:— the enduring good of the future life.

The parable of the dishonest steward, like that of the unjust judge (ch. xviii. 1–8) is a story told to illustrate a single point. The dishonest steward is not to be regarded as *representing* any one; as, in the other parable referred to, the unjust judge cannot represent God. The point is simply this. As worldly men in the management of their affairs act with forethought, so “the children of light,” the followers of Christ, should act with constant reference to the future life, making such use of the wealth which may be intrusted to them here, as to secure the favor of God, and imperishable treasures in heaven.— *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

14–18. (Declarations of Jesus respecting the character of the Pharisees, the kingdom of God, the unchangeableness of the divine law, and the sanctity of marriage.)

“Occasionally St. Luke, after giving the words of our Saviour on some particular occasion, seems to have subjoined other words, uttered by him at a different time, as a sort of commentary on what he then said, or on the incident related, without intending that the latter words should be conjoined with the preceding as forming one discourse, but also without sufficiently

discriminating them ; so that a degree of confusion and obscurity is produced.

“ Thus, the parable of the dishonest steward is concluded with exhortations to the proper use of riches, ending with the declaration, ‘ You cannot be servants of God and of Mammon.’ After which, the narrative of Luke thus proceeds :—

“ ‘ And the Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all this, and scoffed at him. And he said to them, You make yourselves appear righteous in the sight of men, but God knows your hearts. For what is highly exalted among men is an abomination before God.

“ ‘ The Law and the Prophets were till John. Since then the kingdom of God has been announced, and every one is forcing into it.

“ ‘ But heaven and earth may pass away more easily than one tittle fall from the Law.

“ ‘ Whoever puts away his wife and marries another, commits adultery ; and he who marries a woman who has been separated from her husband, commits adultery.’

“ After this follows the parable of Dives and Lazarus.

“ Here, at first view, no connection appears ; but the train of thought admits of an explanation upon the principle just stated.

“ St. Luke having recorded the declaration of Jesus, that the Pharisees, who were highly exalted among men, were an abomination before God, his thoughts turned to that part of their character on which they particularly prided themselves, their strict observance of the Law, that is, the ceremonies and rites of the Law ; and this led him to insert those words of his Master which announced that these ceremonies and rites were abolished by Christianity, that they were virtually abrogated when

John proclaimed the kingdom of heaven. But with these words, as uttered by Jesus, was connected an incidental or parenthetical remark, which is thus given by Matthew (ch. xi. 12): 'From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of Heaven is forcing its way, and the violent are seizing upon it.' I refer to the last words, which are thus expressed by Luke: 'and every one is forcing into it.' In these words I suppose Jesus to have referred to those many Jews, who, possessed with false notions of the character of the Messiah, as a deliverer from the tyranny of the Romans, and ready for deeds of violence, were eager to enlist as his followers, striving to force themselves upon him without any of the dispositions which he required in his disciples. The words in question, as given by Luke, are out of place, and appear only in consequence of their original connection with those which precede.

"But, having introduced this mention of the abolition of the ritual Law, Luke proceeds to limit the language in which it is expressed, by another declaration of our Lord: 'Heaven and earth may pass away more easily than one tittle fall from the Law.' 'The Law' is a term used in the New Testament in various senses, and with a very different force and bearing in different connections. In the mouth of a Jew it denoted, in one of its meanings, the whole of religion as understood by him. The Law, or the Law of God, for the terms were equivalent, was his religion. In this sense the expression might be 'the Law' simply, or 'the Law and the Prophets.' By our Saviour, either term was used in an analogous sense, to denote those essential truths of religion and morality, which alone constitute the Old Testament, or any part of it, a book of religious instruction, and entitle it to be called by the name of 'the

Law.' These, the true Law of God, could never be abrogated. Heaven and earth might pass away, but they would remain unchangeable. Using the term in this meaning, he declares, 'that to do to others as we would that they should do to us, is the Law and the Prophets,' that is, a summary of all the social duties taught by them; and, elsewhere, that the whole Law and the Prophets depend on love to God and love to man. This was the Law from which not the smallest letter nor tittle could pass away; and this Law the Pharisees, instead of observing, were continually violating; and were thus an abomination before God.

"The passage respecting divorce is introduced with reference to the sanction which the Pharisees gave to the greatest license, in this respect, on the part of the husband. No instance, perhaps, could have been chosen, which would have presented in stronger contrast their avowed morality with the morality taught by Christ.

"The parable of Dives and Lazarus has no relation to the Pharisees; for, considering their austerity of manners, Jesus could not have typified them by one who 'feasted sumptuously every day.' It was suggested to the recollection of the Evangelist by the discourse of our Saviour respecting the use and misuse of wealth, which gave occasion to all on which we have been remarking." — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. cci. — cciv.

22. "And the beggar died, and was carried by angels to the bosom of Abraham."

The ancients were accustomed to recline at supper on couches round the table, each resting on his left arm, so that the head of one person was placed against the breast of another. The

representation of Lazarus as carried to Abraham's bosom is founded upon this custom. The meaning is that he was placed next to Abraham at the entertainment by which the blessings of the future life are here and elsewhere figuratively represented. See Matthew viii. 11; xxvi. 29; Luke xiii. 29; xiv. 15; xxii. 30.

In the quotations given by Suicer in his *Thesaurus* (II. 138, 139), I do not find any clear proof that "the bosom of Abraham" was considered the name of a place. Theophanes, however, about the beginning of the ninth, and Theophylact, in the eleventh century, suppose the figure in the present passage to be founded upon the use of *κόλπος* to signify a harbor; and that it denotes those blessings which the good attain after finishing the voyage of life. The figure is once used in the Talmud.

The Roman Catholics explain the phrase as signifying the *Limbus Patrum*.* Their conceptions are founded on a passage in Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion. Lib. IV. c. 34*), who explains "the bosom of Abraham" as meaning a place where the souls of the righteous abide till the general judgment.

XVII. 1-4. (Jesus warns his disciples of the guilt of causing even his humblest follower to fall away, and teaches them the duty of forgiveness.)

In these verses Luke gives a few more passages from the conversation of our Saviour with his disciples which he formerly mentioned (ch. ix. 46-50).

See the note on Matthew xviii. 1-35.

* See Lightfoot and De Lyra in loc.

5 – 10. “And the Apostles said to the Master, Give us stronger assurance,” &c.

The common rendering is, “Increase our faith,” but that given above better expresses, I believe, the state of mind of the Apostles. The words of Jesus, from the sixth verse to the tenth, all, I doubt not, relate to their request; and if this be so, it is evident from the tenor of his reply, that their request was an improper one. The purport of it appears to have been, Display thy power, advance thy kingdom, reward thy followers, and thus give us stronger assurance that thou art the Messiah. They desired such proofs of his being the Messiah as would be accompanied by their own exaltation. In reply, Jesus first reproves them for their want of true faith, such faith as was necessary to qualify them to be his ministers. If they possessed this, it would be rewarded with the gift of miraculous powers. He then teaches them, with humbling severity, that, by performing all the duties to which they had been called, they could establish no claim upon God for such rewards as they were expecting. The language of the parable and of its application is not to be pressed to the letter, nor taken in its most general sense. It is to be regarded as the language of rebuke, intended to repress the presumption of the Apostles; and it may be remarked, that it is such language as none but a teacher from God could have addressed to his followers, under the circumstances in which it was uttered by Jesus, without repelling them from him, and that the thought of such an address would not have entered the mind of any other.

19. “And he said to him, Rise, go your way. Your faith has saved you.”

The words of Christ were obviously meant as some peculiar

praise or encouragement of the Samaritan. But this is inconsistent with the rendering, "Thy faith hath made thee whole," (that is, hath restored thee to health,) or any one equivalent. The other nine were either cured on account of their faith, or they were not. In the first case, there was no distinguishing praise of the Samaritan for the good dispositions which he had shown; and in the second case, if the other nine were cured without faith, it would follow, if we adopt the rendering of the Common Version, that his faith had given him no advantage over them.

The meaning of Christ is, that the Samaritan, in possessing that faith which he had manifested in his conduct, that readiness to acknowledge our Saviour as a minister from God, possessed a principle which would save him from the moral evil in the world and its attendant punishment.

24. "For the day of the Son of Man will be like the lightning which flashes over the whole heaven."

See the explanation of Matthew xxiv. 26, 27, in Appendix, Note E, p. 527.

26. "And as it was in the days of Noah, so will it be in the days of the Son of Man."

What immediately follows relates to the incredulity of the Jews respecting their own destruction. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*

33. "He who is careful of his life will lose it, and he who is careless of his life will save it."

It is probable that these words were not uttered by Jesus in this connection. Here they appear to be used as a strong

expression of the dangers of those times, when he who should endeavor to preserve his life would be no more safe than he who should expose it. The meaning of the corresponding language in the parallel passages is very different. See Matthew x. 39, and the other passages referred to in the note on Luke xxi. 18, 19. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

37. “Where the dead body is, there the eagles will gather together.”

See the note on Matthew xxiv. 28.

XVIII. 7. “And will not God execute justice for his chosen, crying to him day and night, though he delay in their cause?”

This rendering may be correct, or the meaning may be, “though he have borne long with them,” that is, with the enemies of the chosen, the great body of the Jewish nation. Thus understood, the personal pronoun would be used indefinitely, leaving its sense to be determined by the connection, as is often the case in the New Testament.

With the words of our Lord should be compared a passage in Ecclesiasticus (xxxii. 17, 18, according to the Septuagint, or xxxv. 17, 18, in the Common Version), to which it is not improbable that he had reference.

29. “There is none who has given up house, or parents, for the sake of the kingdom of God, who will not receive many fold more in the time that now is,” &c.

“Many fold more” in spiritual blessings ; — in exaltation of

character, in the testimony of a good conscience, in glorious hopes. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

31. “Lo ! we are going up to Jerusalem, and all that has been written by the Prophets will be accomplished in the Son of Man.”

Whether the words of Jesus are here accurately reported or not, what I suppose him to have intended is, that the treatment he was about to suffer would fully correspond to that which, as appeared from the history of the Prophets, the teachers from God had ever been exposed to.

Compare the note on Luke xxiv. 44 – 47.

34. “And they understood this not at all.”

See before, p. 53, and compare Appendix, Note E, p. 558

35 – 43. (Cure of a blind man near Jericho.)

“And as he was approaching Jericho.” Matthew (ch. xx. 29) and Mark (ch. x. 46) represent this miracle as performed when Jesus was *leaving* Jericho, on his way to Jerusalem. The difference in the accounts of the Evangelists is entirely unimportant, except as serving to show that they are independent historians ; and it is idle to try to make them agree by the forced suppositions to which some commentators have resorted. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

XIX. 7. “And all those who saw it murmured,” &c.

Note the loose expression, “*All* those who saw it.”

11-27. (The parable of the faithful and the unfaithful servants.)

This parable in Luke, so far as it relates to a master distributing money to his servants to be used during his absence, is, I conceive, founded on the same discourse of Jesus as the parable of the talents in Matthew (xxv. 14-30). The passages in the two Evangelists are in many parts strikingly coincident; the design of the parable related by Luke, so far as regards the portion of it mentioned, is the same as that of Matthew, and the variations between the two reports are not greater than in other cases where it is evident that the same words of our Lord were meant to be given. Luke particularly mentions the occasion on which the parable he gives was uttered, an occasion probable in itself, so that there seems no reason to doubt that it was delivered at the time stated by him. But if our Lord delivered this parable just before entering Jerusalem, it is unlikely that he would either have repeated it, or have delivered another in great part essentially the same, but a very few days after, to some of his Apostles.

Concluding, therefore, the parable in Matthew and Luke to be the same, we may explain the connection in which Matthew has given it, as an instance of the systematic arrangement found in his Gospel. The parable related to what was to take place at "the coming of Christ"; or, in other words, when the truth of what he taught would be made manifest, and the laws of God's moral government announced by him would take effect. It is in connection with other declarations concerning the same subject that it is introduced by Matthew; and perhaps his omission of that portion which relates to the punishment of the Jews * * * *

29. "The mountain called the Mount of Olives."

A mode of expression adapted to a Gentile reader. So ch. xxi. 37.

42. "O that thou knewest, even thou, even at this thy time, what concerns thy peace!"

"Even thou": — that is, corrupt as thou art, and ill-disposed toward me, thus I earnestly wish even for thee. "Even at this thy time": — even as it were at the last moment.

On the use of *εἰ*, see the note of Grotius on Luke xii. 49.

XX. 9. "A man planted a vineyard, and let it out to husbandmen; and was absent for many years."

The words of the last clause are used in conformity to what is here signified by the parable, namely, God's absence (so to speak) from the Jews for many years, and not in consistency with the imagery of the parable.

It is very remarkable that the name of Jesus occurs but once from this verse to the forty-seventh verse of the twenty-second chapter. Perhaps a more remarkable omission is from Luke x. 42 to xiii. 2, one hundred and fifteen verses; or it may be, to xiii. 12. 'Ο κύριος occurs twice in this interval, as it does once in ch. xxii. 31.

10. Remark the undefined reference of *αὐτῷ*.

20, 21. Note the grammatical ambiguity concerning the subject of the verbs.

34 — 36. Note the diversity from Matthew and Mark.

37. “But that the dead are raised, even Moses has given you to understand, where, in telling of the burning bush, he says,” &c.

Note the expression, ἐμήνυσεν, “has given you to understand.”

Ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, literally, “in the bush,” that is, in the section where the burning bush is spoken of. So Mark xii. 26. Compare Romans xi. 2: “Know you not what the Scripture says ἐν Ἡλίας, in speaking of Elijah?” A similar mode of reference to the Old Testament occurs in the Koran.—*MS. Notes of Lectures.*

40. Compare this verse with Matthew xxii. 34, seqq. Mark xii. 28, seqq.

41. Observe the indefinite use of αὐτούς and λέγουσι. See the note on Matthew viii. 4.

XXI. 18, 19. “Yet not a hair of your heads will be lost. By your constancy secure your lives.”

The expressions in these verses are highly figurative, as appears from what precedes. The parallel passage in Matthew (xxiv. 13) and Mark (xiii. 13) is, Ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται. The present passage is explained by Matthew x. 39: “He who secures his life will lose it; and he who loses his life for my sake will secure it”; compare Matthew xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35; Luke ix. 24. So John xii. 25: “He who loves his life will lose it; and he who hates his life in this world will preserve it for eternal blessedness.”

For the expression, “Not a hair of your heads will be lost,” see 1 Samuel xiv. 45; 2 Samuel xiv. 11; 1 Kings i. 52; Acts

xxvii. 34. The meaning of the phrase according to its common use would be, Your lives will be perfectly secure. In the present passage its meaning is analogous, but far higher and more important, — Your existence will be perfectly secure. Men may put you to death, but you will not cease to be. You will enjoy the favor and be the constant care of God, who will give you eternal life. The encouragement here is founded on the same considerations as in the precept before given by our Saviour: “Fear not those who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul.” (Matthew x. 28 ; compare Luke xii. 4, 5.)

22. “For those will be days of vengeance, when all that is written will be fulfilled.”

“All that is written.” “‘*Tout ce qui a été écrit.*’ Toutes les menaces qui sont dans tout le V. T. contre les Juifs désobéissans et impénitens, comme celles qui sont Deut. xxviii, xxxi, et xxxii, et à la fin des prophéties de Malachi.” — Le Clerc.

24. “Jerusalem will be trodden by the feet of Gentiles, till the times of the Gentiles are ended.”

“Trodden by the feet of Gentiles” means inhabited by Gentiles or heathens. “Till the times of the Gentiles are ended”: that is, till those regarded by the Jews as Gentiles or Heathens shall have ceased to exist under that character, shall no longer stand in that relation to the Jews; till the distinction between Jews and Gentiles shall have passed away.

25. “And there will be signs in the sun and moon and stars,” &c.

Note the imperfect and obscure expression of Luke, in the

first clause, as compared with Matthew (xxiv. 29) and Mark (xiii. 24).

It seems evident that Luke's is a later and less exact account than that of Matthew and Mark of those portions of our Lord's prophecy which they have in common.

37. "At night he went out to the Mount of Olives."

That is, probably, to Bethany. He left the city to avoid the danger to which he might be exposed during the night from the machinations of his enemies.

XXII. 1. "And the festival of Unleavened Bread, which is called the Passover, was at hand."

"— which is called the Passover." This explanation shows that Luke's Gospel was intended for Gentile readers.

19. "And he took a loaf, and gave thanks, and broke it, and gave it to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you. Do thus as my memorial."

The rendering of this verse requires some explanation, in consequence of the errors which have arisen from a misapprehension of this account of our Lord's last supper with his disciples.

I render, "Do thus"; the verbal rendering is, "Do this," that is, "Do this act." But the particular act of our Lord could not be repeated, and the meaning obviously is, "Do like acts," or, in other words, "Do thus."

The force of the injunction, however, did not bear upon the act itself, but upon that of which the act was symbolical, — upon the precept which Jesus had conveyed more impressively by significant emblems than he might have done by words alone. That precept, to express it in figurative language, conformable to the symbol, was, “Eat of the same loaf,” or, in literal language, “Be perfectly at accord with one another.” (See the note on Matthew xxvi. 26–28.)

“Do thus, as *my memorial*.” The meaning is, Be perfectly at accord with one another, as the proper commemoration of me, your common Master.

These words neither Matthew, who, being an Apostle, was present on the occasion, nor Mark, who probably derived his account from Peter, relates as having been uttered by Jesus. If uttered by him, therefore, they were not regarded by them as enjoining the celebration of a rite, for in that case they would have been essential to give its character to the transaction. Paul (1 Corinthians xi. 24, 25) ascribes the same words to our Lord, not merely in distributing the bread, but in giving the cup to his disciples.

The sentiments which it was the purpose of Jesus to connect with those acts, the duties which he intended to enforce by them, and especially the sentiment conveyed in the words just referred to, were most strikingly brought into view and inculcated throughout his conversation with his disciples at this time, as recorded by John (ch. xiii. 34, 35). “A new commandment I give you, that you love one another, — that you love one another as I have loved you. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another.” This was to be their commemoration of him.

Notwithstanding the false meaning, as I conceive it to be,

which has been put upon the words, "Do this as my memorial," according to which it has been supposed that our Lord instituted a particular ceremony in commemoration of himself, yet, when the conception is fairly presented, it can hardly be thought that he meant solemnly to enjoin on his Apostles to bring him to their remembrance by eating and drinking at certain times in a particular manner, — eating of the same loaf and drinking from the same cup. It cannot be believed that it was requisite for them thus to recall him to their minds. What recollections, feelings, or purposes during their subsequent lives could tend to efface the memory of him? But should any one suppose that this ceremonial observance was enjoined by our Lord upon his Apostles who were then with him, yet his words cannot reasonably be regarded as affording any ground for inferring that he meant to institute a rite to be observed by all who might in future times receive his religion, — by his followers throughout all ages, standing, as they would, in very different relations from those of the Apostles to himself and to one another.

At the same time when Jesus broke the loaf for his disciples, and gave them the cup, he performed another significant act; he washed their feet. Having done so, he said to them: "Understand what I have done for you. If I, the Master and the Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. I have given you an example, that you also may do as I have done for you." (John xiii. 12 – 15.) If his words could in either case be understood as instituting a rite to be perpetually observed, it would be in this case, and not in that we have been considering. But it was not his purpose to institute a religious ceremony, when he told his disciples that in washing their feet he had given them an example

which they should imitate. His sole object was to inculcate upon them, in the most impressive manner, the duty of such mutual love, of such freedom from rivalry among themselves, and from the sin of pride, that they might be ready, after his example, to perform the humblest offices for one another.

If the preceding remarks are correct, it follows that the obligation to observe the Lord's Supper at the present day rests wholly on the good effects which may attend its observance. These may consist either in its exciting religious sentiments and purposes in him who partakes of it, or, as regards others, in its being a public profession of his faith in Christianity, and his desire to conform himself to its spirit. It is not to be viewed as a rite enjoined upon us by our Lord.

20. Note the peculiarity of Luke's account in mentioning the cup twice, and observe the defectiveness of his narration in verses 21–23. Note also the ungrammatical construction of verse 20, and the very imperfect expression.

24–27. “And there existed a rivalry among them,” &c.

See the note on John xiii. 2–17.

31–34. (Our Lord's prediction of the denial of Peter.)

We have an example of the inexact manner in which events are related by the Evangelists in their accounts of our Lord's prediction of the denial of Peter. (See Matthew xxvi. 30–35; Mark xiv. 26–31; John xiii. 36–38.) Matthew and Mark represent this prediction as having been uttered on the way to Gethsemane. Luke and John report it as spoken before Jesus

and his disciples left the house where they were. Matthew and Mark agree in the words by which it was introduced, — “There is none of you whose faith in me will not be shaken this night.” The words reported by Luke are very different, though they refer to the same event. But John introduces the prediction quite otherwise.

34. Note the use of the word *σήμερον*, “to-day,” which, perhaps, implies that Luke apprehended that these words were uttered toward morning.

35 - 38. “And he said to them, Now let him who has a purse take it, and his bag also ; and let him who has not, sell his cloak and buy a sword,” &c.

The language of this passage is highly figurative, and remote from those modes of expression with which we are familiar. Jesus reminds his disciples that formerly they might rely on the hospitality of their countrymen for the supply of their wants. They had been welcomed by many as the harbingers of the Messiah. But now the nation had rejected him as not its Messiah. He was reckoned among malefactors. He was about to be crucified with robbers. And they, his followers, must look for no favor. They would be in the condition of those to whom hospitality is denied, who must provide for their necessities from their own means, or who, being destitute of money, if they will not submit to suffer from want, must procure swords and turn robbers. That they should become robbers might be expected of the followers of a Master who could be thought to deserve such ignominy and such cruelty as he was about to suffer. The manner in which he was regarded, and the cir-

circumstances to which they would be reduced, are emblematically brought before their imaginations by a precept enjoining such a course of conduct as answered to the character ascribed to him, and such as, in those unprincipled and barbarous times, many were driven to adopt.

When the disciples produced the two swords, it is not to be supposed that they understood their Master literally. It was obviously a very natural act to do so, without any definite purpose. But it is probable that they did not fully comprehend his meaning, and supposed that by showing those swords they might lead him to explain himself further. But he was not, it appears, disposed to continue the discourse.

40. “And when he had come to the place.”

“*The place*,” that is, the well-known place, the scene of the events subsequently related.

43, 44. “And there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony, he prayed the more earnestly; and his sweat was as great drops of blood falling to the ground.”

On the evidence, both external and internal, against the genuineness of this passage, which is not retained in the Translation, see Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. Additional Note A, Section V. vi. pp. lxxxvii. – xci.

53. “But this is your hour, and the power of darkness prevails.”

A strictly verbal rendering, supplying in the last clause the words *αὕτη ἐστίν*, which must be repeated from the first, would

be, "This is your hour, and this is the power of darkness." The meaning of Jesus was, You feared to apprehend me in the daytime, when I was with you in the temple, but this, the night, is your hour, and the power of darkness (that is, the power of evil) is suffered to prevail. — The figurative expression, "the power of darkness," to denote the power of evil, was a familiar metaphor, not borrowed from, but only suggested by, the darkness of the hour.

XXIII. 2. "We have ascertained that this man is raising sedition among the people, and forbidding them to pay tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is the Messiah, the king."

This accusation is not mentioned by the other Evangelists, though there is an implication of it in the question of Pilate, "Are you the king of the Jews?" which they all record. It did not occur to them that this question might need explanation to readers less familiar than themselves with the history of their Master. This is one example among many of the imperfect character of their narratives, and of the fact that much is omitted which, if expressed, would have served to remove difficulties. We find another instance in the fourth verse of this chapter, in the striking inconsequence of Pilate's answer to the Jews, when taken in connection with what precedes. John (ch. xviii. 33–38) supplies what is wanting. Luke himself, in the fourteenth verse of the present chapter, affords an indication of the incompleteness of his own account. He there represents Pilate as speaking of having examined Jesus before the Jews, but he has not given the details of this examination. These are to be found only in John.

The account which follows (vv. 7–12) of Pilate's sending our Lord to Herod is peculiar to Luke. But there is nothing in it inconsistent with what is told by the other Evangelists. The narratives in the Gospels, though here, as often elsewhere, imperfect and fragmentary, supply each other's deficiencies, and, taken together, form an harmonious, consistent history, stamped with the clearest marks of truth.—*MS. Notes of Lectures.*

31. “For if they do thus while the tree is green, what will befall it when it is dry?”

The meaning is, If the Jews do thus while the nation may be compared to a green tree yet living, what will befall them when the nation (like the barren fig-tree) is blasted and withered by God?

40. “But the other rebuked him, saying, Do you not fear God? You are suffering under the same sentence.”

The meaning is, Do you not fear God, when your own death is close at hand, that you thus insult a dying fellow-sufferer?

47. “Truly this was a righteous man.”

Compare Matthew (xxvii. 54) and Mark (xv. 39). The discrepance between them and Luke illustrates the character of the narratives given by the Evangelists of the transactions connected with the death of our Lord, — agreeing in the essential facts, but differing, as might be expected, in minor particulars.

48, 49. Note the loose manner in which πάντες is used, as often elsewhere.

54. “And it was the day of Preparation; and the Sabbath was dawning.”

“— was dawning,” ἐπέφωσκε. Wakefield supposes this word to relate to the custom of lighting lamps as a religious ceremony, on the evening on which the Sabbath commenced. This custom is mentioned in the Mishna; and likewise by Seneca (Epistle 95). So Wetstein. See Lightfoot, Gill, Spencer de Legg. Heb. Lib. IV. c. 6. p. 1120. Kuinoel, following Grotius, explains it as equivalent to ἤμελλε ἐπιφώσκειν, but thinks, at the same time, that there is a reference to the custom just mentioned. Campbell supposes that St. Luke, by living among Gentiles, insensibly acquired the habit of using ἐπιφώσκειν, without reference to its proper meaning, merely to denote the commencement of a day. He argues against the explanation first mentioned and that of Lightfoot.

Lightfoot supposes that the use of the word is to be explained by the use of the corresponding words זמן and זמן־לילה, which he states that the Jews employed to denote the evening; the former being found in the Mishna, as I understand, and the latter in the Gemara. He produces various passages in proof of his assertion. He says that זמן was commonly used to denote the beginning of the night, but in one instance, he thinks, the whole night. In the Gemara זמן־לילה is explained as meaning the evening twilight. Buxtorf, in his Rabbinical Lexicon, says that it is used *pro lumine stellarum, sive stellis, hoc est vespérâ*. Le Clerc, in his translation of Hammond's paraphrase, explains σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε, *stellis incipientibus ful-*

gere, Sabbatum incipiebat, and Rosenmüller understands it in a similar manner.

I believe, however, that none of these explanations is to be adopted; but that the words are to be taken in their proper sense, namely, "The Sabbath was dawning."

According to Matthew and Mark, Joseph of Arimathæa went to Pilate in *the evening* to ask for the body of Jesus. If the word rendered "evening" is to be taken in its obvious sense, this alone is decisive of the question;—since all the explanations have been resorted to on the supposition, that the day of the Sabbath properly commenced at sunset, and that our Lord was laid in the tomb before its commencement.

It has been supposed, however, that the Jews distinguished two evenings, one beginning either about noon, or at the ninth hour (the middle of the afternoon), and ending at sunset, and the other beginning at sunset and ending with the disappearance of twilight; and that Matthew and Mark, when they speak of the evening, refer to the former period.

But there seems to me little ground for the opinion that the Jews thus distinguished those two portions of time, and none whatever for believing that they applied to the earlier portion the Greek word *ἑσπρία*, "evening," as its proper designation. It would indeed be an absurdity to suppose that they applied any one word, without a distinguishing epithet, indiscriminately to two different portions of time which they meant to discriminate from each other. Nor, if it be imagined that *ἑσπρία*, "evening," was ever used as an appropriate name for the afternoon, or the latter part of the afternoon, would it have been thus used in the present case by Matthew and Mark, as they had already made it so evident that the event of which they spoke must have occurred after the ninth hour.

Let us then attend to the series of events which took place after the commencement of the evening.

The Jews had requested Pilate that the bodies should be removed from the crosses, and Joseph of Arimathæa went to him to ask for the body of Jesus. Pilate doubted if he were already dead, and sent for the centurion to inquire. His doubts being removed, Joseph was permitted to take the body of our Lord. Having bought a linen cloth to wrap it in, he was joined by Nicodemus, who had procured a large quantity of spices. They washed the body and wrapped it in the linen cloth with the spices; and then they laid it in a tomb, which was unfinished, and wanted a door, so that they had to find and bring a large stone with which to close it.

These transactions probably occupied many hours; and we may well believe that the dawn of the Sabbath was appearing, when those who had performed the last offices for our Lord were leaving the tomb.

56. “Having rested on the Sabbath according to the commandment,” &c.

“According to the commandment”:—an explanation intended for Gentiles.

XXIV. 25, 26. “And Jesus said to them, How dull of apprehension are ye, and slow to give credit to all that the Prophets have spoken! Was it not necessary that the Messiah through these sufferings should enter on his glory?”

There is no ground for believing that Luke has given the precise words spoken in this conversation. But there is no

difficulty in explaining the language ascribed to our Lord in these verses. The emphatic word is "all." The reference, supposing that we have his very words, is to the fact, that his disciples, in common with the rest of the Jews, overlooked the descriptions given by the Prophets of the persecution and sufferings of the true teachers from God. They had thought only of the glories and triumphs of the Messiah.

34. "— who told them that the Master had truly risen, and had appeared to Simon."

This appearance to Peter is not mentioned by the other Evangelists. It is, however, referred to by Paul, 1 Corinthians xv. 5.

44—47. ' And he said to them, This is what I told you while I was yet with you, that it was necessary that whatever is written in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms concerning me, should be accomplished. Then he opened their minds to understand the Scriptures," &c.

"This is what I told you":—verbally, "These are the words which I spoke to you." The meaning is, The events which have taken place correspond to what I told you, to the words which I spoke to you. Our Lord refers to his predictions of his future sufferings and death.

Compare with this passage vv. 25—27.

"What our Saviour probably did, in both these discourses, was to point out the consistency between the character and purposes of God, as revealed in the Old Testament, and the circumstances attending his mission, and the character of his

religion. His disciples had regarded the Jewish dispensation as introductory to a better, the temporal kingdom of the Messiah. He opened their minds to enlarged views of it, and taught them that, conformably to a right understanding of its purpose, it was a spiritual, and not a temporal kingdom, for which it was intended to prepare. He showed them from Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms in what the true happiness of man had been always, by their holiest and most enlightened teachers, represented as consisting, and the suitability of everything in Christianity to enable man to attain this happiness. He explained to them that his death and resurrection, however foreign from all the notions which they had formerly entertained respecting the Messiah, were necessary parts of that glorious plan of Providence so long ago commenced, which he came to accomplish. He illustrated the connection between the Jewish and Christian dispensations. He pointed out some of the most striking passages of the Jewish Scriptures which related to himself; that is, which related to Christianity, as serving to show that the same design was apparent in both dispensations. He was not employed in expounding prophecies respecting himself personally." — *On the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Christian Examiner, Vol. V. pp. 56, 57.

Compare the notes on Matthew xxvi. 54; Luke xviii. 31; xxi. 22; xxiv. 25 – 27; John xvii. 12; v. 46. See also, in relation to this subject, Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. II. pp. cxciv, cxcv, and the review of Hengstenberg's Christology (by the Rev. Dr. Noyes) in the Christian Examiner for July, 1834, Vol. XVI. pp. 321 – 364.

N O T E S

ON

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

NOTES ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

I. 1 – 18. (The Introduction of John's Gospel.)

“ ‘In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God.’

“There is no word in English answering to the Greek word *Logos*, as here used. It was employed to denote a mode of conception concerning the Deity, familiar at the time when St. John wrote, and intimately blended with the philosophy of his age, but long since obsolete, and so foreign from our habits of thinking, that it is not easy for us to conform our minds to its apprehension. The Greek word *Logos*, in one of its primary senses, answered nearly to our word *Reason*. It denoted that faculty by which the mind disposes its ideas in their proper relations to each other; the Disposing Power, if I may so speak, of the mind. In reference to this primary sense, it was applied to the Deity, but in a wider significance. The Logos of God was regarded, not in its strictest sense, as merely the Reason of God; but, under certain aspects, as the Wisdom, the Mind, the Intellect of God. To this the creation of all things was *especially* ascribed. The conception may seem obvious in itself; but the cause why the creation was primarily referred to the Logos or Intellect of God, rather than to his goodness or omnipotence, is to be found in the Platonic philosophy, as it

existed about the time of Christ, and particularly as taught by the eminent Jewish philosopher, Philo of Alexandria.

“According to this philosophy, there existed an archetypal world of IDEAS, formed by God, the perfect model of the sensible universe; corresponding, so far as what is divine may be compared with what is human, to the plan of a building or city which an architect forms in his own mind before commencing its erection. The faculty by which God disposed and arranged the world of Ideas was his Logos, Reason, or Intellect. This world, according to one representation, was supposed to have its seat in the Logos or Mind of God; according to another, it was identified with the Logos. The Platonic philosophy further taught, that the Ideas of God were not merely the archetypes, but, in scholastic language, the essential forms, of all created things.* In this philosophy, matter in *its primary state*, primitive matter, if I may so speak, was regarded merely as the substratum of attributes, being in itself devoid of all. Attributes, it was conceived, were impressed upon it by the Ideas of God, which Philo often speaks of under the figure of *seals*. These Ideas, indeed, constituted those attributes, becoming connected with primitive matter in an incomprehensible manner, and thus giving form and being to all things sensible. But the seat of these Ideas, these formative principles, being the Logos or Intellect of God, — or, according to the other representation mentioned, these Ideas constituting the Logos, — the Logos was, in consequence, represented as the great agent in creation. This doctrine being settled, the meaning of the term gradually extended itself by a natural process, and came at last to comprehend *all the attributes of God manifested in the crea-*

* For an account of Plato's doctrine of Ideas, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. III. Additional Note A.

*tion and government of the universe.** These attributes, abstractly from God himself, were made an object of thought under the name of the Logos. The Logos thus conceived of was necessarily personified or spoken of figuratively as a person. In our own language, in describing its agency, — agency in its nature personal and to be ultimately referred to God, — we might indeed avoid attaching a personal character to the Logos considered abstractly from God, by the use of the neuter pronoun *it*. Thus we might say, All things were made by *it*. But the Greek language afforded no such resource, the relative pronoun in concord with Logos being necessarily masculine. Thus the Logos or Intellect of God came to be, figuratively or literally, conceived of as an intermediate being between God and his creatures, the great agent in the creation and government of the universe.

“Obsolete as this mode of conception has now become, there is a foundation for it in the nature of the being contemplated, and of the human mind. The Deity conceived of as existing within himself, removed from all distinct apprehension of created intelligences, dwelling alone in his unapproachable and unimaginable infinity of perfections, presents a different object to the mind from the Deity operating around us and within us, and manifesting himself, as it were, even to our senses. It is not strange, therefore, that these two conceptions of him have been regarded apart, and more or less separated from each other. The notion of the Logos, it is true, is obsolete ; but we

* [Thus Clement of Alexandria says : “The Logos of the Father of all is the wisdom and goodness of God made most clearly manifest, his almighty and truly divine power, his sovereign will.” — *Stromat* V. § 1. pp. 646, 647, as quoted in the *Statement of Reasons*, p. 277.]

find something analogous to it in the use of the term *Nature* in modern times. Employed as this often is, the mind seems to rest in some indistinct notion of an agency inferior to the Supreme, or an agency, to say the least, which is not referred directly to God.

“The conception and the name of the Logos were familiar at the time when St. John wrote. They occur in the Apocryphal book of the Wisdom of Solomon. The writer, speaking of the destruction of the first-born of the Egyptians, says (ch. xviii. 15) :—

“‘Thine almighty Logos leaped down from heaven, from his royal throne, a fierce warrior, into the midst of a land of destruction.’

“In another passage, likewise, in the prayer ascribed to Solomon, he is represented as thus addressing God (ch. ix. 1, 2) :—

‘ God of our fathers, and Lord of mercy,
Who hast made all things by thy Logos,
And fashioned man by thy Wisdom.’

“The terms, *the Logos of God*, and *the Wisdom of God*, are here used as nearly equivalent in signification. A certain distinction was sometimes made between them; but they were often considered as the same. In the book just quoted we find strong personifications of Wisdom,* considered as an attribute of God, and described in such language as was afterwards applied to the Logos. In the Proverbs there are similar personifications of Wisdom,† which the Christian Fathers commonly understood of the Logos.

“The use of the word ‘Logos,’ in the sense that has been

* Ch. vii., viii., x.

† Ch. viii. See also ch. i. 20, seqq.; ch. iii. 19.

assigned to it, was derived from the Platonic philosophy. But we find among the Jews a similar mode of conceiving and speaking of the operations of God, unconnected with this philosophy, and appearing in the use of a different term, *the Spirit of God*, or *the Holy Spirit*. By either expression, in its primary theological sense, was intended those attributes, or that power of God, which operated among men to produce effects that were believed to be conformable to his will, as manifested in the laws of his moral government. Thus the miracles of a teacher from God, the direct influences of God upon the minds of men, and all causes tending to advance men in excellence, moral and intellectual, were referred to the Holy Spirit. The idea of its invisible operation was associated with it. To express what has been said in different terms, it denoted the unseen Power of God, acting upon the minds of men in the direct or indirect production of moral goodness, or intellectual ability, in the communication of truth, and in the conferring of supernatural powers. The conception is of the same class with that of the Logos; and the Holy Spirit is in some instances strongly personified, as by our Saviour in his last discourse with his Apostles. The divine Power which was manifested in Christ might be ascribed indifferently to the Spirit, or to the Logos, of God, as the reader or hearer was more conversant with the one term or the other. St. John, writing in Asia Minor, where many for whom he intended his Gospel were familiar with the conception of the Logos, has, probably for this reason, adopted the term 'Logos,' in the proem of his Gospel, to express that manifestation of God by Christ which is elsewhere referred to the Spirit of God.*

* It may be observed, that, amid the confusion and inconsistency

“But to return: The conception that has been described having been formed of the Logos, and the Logos being, as I have said, necessarily personified, or spoken of figuratively as a person, it soon followed, as a natural consequence, that the Logos was by many hypostatized or conceived of as a proper person.* When the corrective of experience and actual knowledge cannot be applied, what is strongly imagined is very likely to be

of those conceptions of the earlier Fathers which afterwards settled into the doctrine of the Trinity, we often find the Holy Spirit and the Logos spoken of as the same power of God. Thus Justin Martyr, in reference to the miraculous conception of Christ, says (*Apologia Prima*, c. 33. p. 54): ‘We must not understand by the Spirit and the power from God anything different from the Logos, who is the First-born of God.’ Theophilus of Antioch says (*Ad Autolyceum*, Lib. II. § 10), that ‘the Logos is the Spirit of God and his Wisdom’; though he elsewhere (*Ibid.* § 15 et § 18) makes a Trinity of God, his Logos, and his Wisdom. The Wisdom of God was commonly conceived of as the Logos of God, but Irenæus, like Theophilus, gives the former name to the Holy Spirit. (See Lib. IV. c. 20.) Tertullian says (*Advers. Praxeam*, c. 26): ‘The Spirit of God [the Spirit spoken of in the account of the miraculous conception] is the same as the Logos. For as, when John says, *The Logos was made flesh*, we by the Logos understand the Spirit, so here we perceive the Logos to be intended under the name of the Spirit. For as the Spirit is the substance of the Logos, so the Logos is the operation of the Spirit; and the two are one thing. What! when John said that the Logos was made flesh, and the angel, that the Spirit was to be made flesh, did they mean anything different?’” See also c. 14; *Advers. Marcion*. Lib. V. c. 8, et alibi sæpe; Irenæus, *Cont. Hæres.* Lib. V. c. 1. § 2.

“* It will be convenient in what follows to use the terms *personify* and *hypostatize*, with their correlatives, as distinguished from each other according to the senses assigned them in the text.”

regarded as having a real existence ; and the philosophy of the ancients was composed in great part of such imaginations. The Logos, it is to be recollected, was that power by which God disposed in order the Ideas of the archetypal world. But in particular reference to the creation of the material universe, the Logos came in time to be conceived of by many as hypostatized, as a proper person going forth, as it were, from God in order to execute the plan prepared, to dispose and arrange all things conformably to it, and to give sensible forms to *primitive matter*, by impressing it with the Ideas of the archetypal world. In many cases in which the term ‘Logos’ occurs, if we understand by it the Disposing Power of God in a sense conformable to the notions explained, we may have a clearer idea of its meaning, than if we render it by the term ‘Reason,’ or ‘Wisdom,’ or any other which our language offers.

“In the writings of Philo, who was contemporary with our Saviour, we find the Logos clearly and frequently hypostatized. According to him, considered as a person, the Logos is a god. In a passage which has been closely imitated by Origen, he says : ‘Let us inquire if there are really two Gods.’ He answers : ‘The true God is one, but there are many who, in a less strict use of language, are called gods.’ The true God, he says, is denoted by that name with the article ; others have it without the article ; and thus his most venerable Logos is called god without the article.* ‘No one,’ he says, ‘can comprehend the nature of God ; it is well if we can comprehend his *name*,

* De Somniis, Lib. I. Opp. I. 655. Comp. Origen’s Comment. in Joan. Tom. II. Opp. IV. 50, 51.” Clement of Alexandria, remarking on Genesis iv. 25, says, Οὐ γὰρ Θεὸν ἀπλῶς προσεῖπεν ὁ τῇ τοῦ ἄρθρου προτάξει τὸν παντοκράτορα δηλώσας. — Stromat. III. § 12. p. 548.

that is, the Logos, his interpreter; for he may be considered, perhaps, as the god of us imperfect beings, but the Most High as the God of the wise and perfect.* He represents the Logos as the instrument (*ὄργανον*) of God in the creation of the universe; as the image of God, by whom the universe was fashioned; as used by him, like a helm, in directing the course of all things; as he who himself sits at the helm and orders all things; and as his first-born son, his vicegerent in the government of the world.† ‘Those,’ says Philo, ‘who have true knowledge [knowledge of God] are rightly called sons of God. Let him, then, who is not yet worthy to be called a son of God, strive to fashion himself to the resemblance of God’s first-born Logos, the most ancient angel, being as it were an archangel with many titles.’‡ A little after, he calls the Logos ‘the eternal image of God’; and elsewhere applies to him the epithet ‘eternal.’ He represents the Logos as a mediator between God and his creatures. ‘To the archangel, the most ancient Logos, God freely granted the high distinction of standing between and separating the creation from its Creator. With the immortal being, he intercedes for what is mortal and perishing. He announces the will of the Ruler to his subjects. Being neither unoriginated like God, nor originated like man, but standing between the two extremes, he is a hostage to both; being a pledge to the Creator that the whole race of men shall never fall away and revolt, preferring disorder to order; and

* Legg. Allegorr. Lib. III. Opp. I. 128.

† De Cherubim. I. 162. De Monarchiâ, Lib. II. Opp. II. 225. De Migrat. Abraham. I. 437. De Cherubim. I. 145. De Agriculturâ. I. 308.

‡ De Confusione Linguarum. I. 426, 427.

giving assurance to the creature that the God of Mercy will never neglect what he has made.' *

“Such conceptions are expressed by Philo concerning the Logos as a person. If his representations of him, so far as they have been quoted, are not perfectly consistent, they do not imply that he wavered much in the view of his character; and these representations were received by the early Fathers as the groundwork of their doctrine concerning the personal Logos. But upon further examination, the opinions of Philo will appear more unsettled and unsteady; and new conceptions will present themselves. To these we shall advert hereafter. It is only necessary here to observe, that in his opinions relating to this subject there was little fixedness or consistency. The images which floated before his mind changed their forms. Throughout his writings, he often speaks of the personal agency of the Deity in language as simple as that of the Old Testament. In a large portion of the passages in which he makes mention of the Logos, it may be doubted whether he conceived of it, *for the time*, otherwise than as an attribute or attributes of God. On the other hand, it is also to be observed, that the influence of his Platonism, when it was ascendant in his mind, did not terminate in hypostatizing the Logos alone among the powers or attributes of God.

“FROM the explanations which have been given of the conceptions concerning the Logos of God, it will appear that this term properly denoted an attribute or attributes of God; and that upon the notion of an attribute or attributes the idea of personality was superinduced. Let us now con-

* *Quis Rerum Divinarum Hæres.* I. 501, 502.

sider the probable meaning of the first words of St. John's Gospel.

“‘In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God.’

“These words admit, I think, only of two explanations. Either St. John used the word ‘Logos’ simply to denote the conception of those attributes of God which are manifested in the creation and government of the universe; and in the last clause intended to declare, that, in the contemplation of them, no other being but God is to be contemplated, and that all their operations are to be referred directly to him;—or he meant to speak of those attributes as hypostatized, and to represent the Logos of God as a proper person (such as he is described by Philo), the minister and vicegerent of God, who, always acting by the power, and conformably to the will, of God, might rhetorically be called God, according to the figure by which we transfer to an agent the name of his principal.

“It is contended, indeed, that his words admit of a different meaning; that the Logos is here spoken of as a proper person; but that this person is, at the same time, declared to be, literally, God. But if we so understand St. John, his words will express a contradiction in terms. ‘The Logos,’ he says, ‘was WITH God,’ which, if the Logos be a person, necessarily implies that he is a different person from God. Whoever is WITH any being must be diverse from that being with whom he is. As far, then, as we may be assured that St. John did not affirm an absurdity in terms, so far we may be assured that he did not affirm that the Logos, being a person with God, was also, literally, God. Of the Evangelist we may here say, as Tertullian says concerning another passage quoted from him: ‘Secundum omnia [in suo evangelio] potius quam adversus

omnia, etiam adversus suos sensus interpretandus';—'He is to be explained conformably to all, rather than in opposition to all that he has elsewhere written, and in opposition, too, to the sense of the words themselves.' Here, therefore, we dismiss the Trinitarian exposition, and proceed to consider how the passage is to be understood.

"We have now only to choose between the two explanations first given. St. John has *personified*, or he has *hypostatized* the Logos. He has spoken of the Logos simply as of the attributes, or, as we may say, the Power of God, manifested in his works; or he has adopted the philosophy of some of his contemporaries, and intended to represent this Power as a person.

"Whether St. John did or did not adopt this Platonic conception, is a question not important to be settled in order to determine our own judgment concerning its truth. But that he did not, is rendered probable by his not alluding to it elsewhere in his Gospel, and by his never in any other place introducing an intermediate agent between God and his creation, or referring the Divine Power manifested in Christ to any other being but God himself. It is unlikely that he would receive a doctrine of this kind, which had not been taught by his Master; and neither he nor any other of the Evangelists has recorded that this doctrine was taught by Christ. The nature of the doctrine itself, which presents the strange conception of an hypostatized attribute or attributes, would alone forbid the supposition of its having such an origin. It is clearly traced to a different source, to a philosophy which, considering St. John's intellectual habits and his manner of life, was not likely to have a strong influence over his mind.

"But, setting aside these considerations, the passage itself affords, perhaps, sufficient reason for believing that the Evan-

gelist did not intend to speak of an hypostatized Logos. 'The Logos,' he says, 'was God,' that is, the Supreme Being. If we conceive of the Logos as a person, the agent of God, those words considered in themselves admit, as I have said, of a figurative sense. But they would express an assertion which is made by no other writer who entertained this conception of the Logos. Philo, or the earlier Christian Fathers, would, equally, have shrunk from asserting the Logos to be God, as the word 'God' is used by us. The earlier Fathers understood the term 'god,' as here used by St. John, in an inferior sense, regarding it as denoting what we might express in English by saying, that the Logos was a 'divine being.' But this, unquestionably, is not its true sense. St. John, having just used the word *Θεός*, 'God,' to denote the Supreme Being, would not in the next clause thus vary its signification; and corresponding likewise to what I have before observed,* his general use of this term, like that of the other Apostles and Evangelists, was the same with our own use of the name 'God.' Assuming, then, that the word *Θεός*, 'God,' in the passage before us, denotes the Deity, what purpose or inducement could St. John have had to assert, in a figurative sense, that the Logos was the Deity, upon the supposition that he believed the Logos to be a distinct person, the agent of the Deity? I think none can be conjectured.

"Thus far, I have been arguing merely against the supposition, that St. John adopted the Platonic conception of an hypostatized Logos. But as to the further supposition, that he believed his Master, Jesus Christ, to have been not a man, properly speaking, but that Logos clothed in flesh, it is here suffi-

* See Statement of Reasons, p. 226.

cient, after all that has been said, to remark its inconsistency with the whole character of his narrative and those of the other Evangelists, and with every other part of the New Testament. Had St. John believed his Master to be an incarnation of a great being, to whom the name Logos might be applied, superior to all other beings except God, we could, with our present view of the character of the Apostle, assign no other ground for this belief, than an assurance of the fact, resting upon miraculous evidence. Had he, then, held this belief, he would everywhere have spoken of his Master conformably to it. Christ would have appeared throughout his Gospel and the other Gospels, not as a man, which he was not, but as the incarnate Logos, which he was. No reason can be assigned why he should not have been usually denominated by that name, his real character kept constantly in view, and all his words, actions, and sufferings correctly represented as those of the agent intermediate between God and his universe.

“ Let us now examine whether the language of the Apostle can be better explained, if we understand him as using the term ‘Logos’ merely to denote the attributes of God manifested in his works. It was his purpose, in the introduction of his Gospel, to declare that Christianity had the same divine origin as the universe itself; that it was to be considered as proceeding from the same power of God. Writing in Asia Minor for readers by many of whom the term ‘Logos’ was more familiarly used than any other to express the attributes of God viewed in relation to his creatures, he adopted this term to convey his meaning, because, from their associations with it, it was fitted particularly to impress and affect their minds; thus connecting the great truth which he taught with their former modes of thinking and speaking. But upon the idea primarily

expressed by this term, a new conception, the conception of the proper personality of those attributes, had been superinduced. This doctrine, then, the doctrine of an hypostatized Logos, it appears to have been his purpose to set aside. He would guard himself, I think, against being understood to countenance it. The Logos, he teaches, was not the agent of God, but God himself. Using the term merely to denote the attributes of God as manifested in his works, he teaches that the operations of the Logos are the operations of God; that all conceived of under that name is to be referred immediately to God; that in speaking of the Logos we speak of God, 'that the Logos is God.'

"The Platonic conception of a personal Logos, distinct from God, was the embryo form of the Christian Trinity. If, therefore, the view just given of the purpose of St. John be correct, it is a remarkable fact, that his language has been alleged as a main support of that very doctrine, the rudiments of which it was intended to oppose.

"Considering how prevalent was the conception of the Logos as a distinct being from God, it is difficult to suppose that St. John did not have it in mind. But it is to be observed, that the preceding explanation of his words is independent of this supposition, and that they are to be understood in the same manner, whether they are supposed to refer to that conception or not.

"It is, then, of the attributes of God as displayed in the creation and government of the world, that St. John speaks under the name of 'the Logos.' To this name we have none equivalent in English, for we have not the conception which it was intended to express. The term 'Power of God' is, perhaps, as nearly equivalent as any that we can conveniently use.

But in order to enter into the meaning of the passage, we must associate with this term, not the meaning alone which the English words might suggest according to their common use, but the whole notion of the Logos as present to the mind of the Apostle.

“ Adopting this term, we may say that the Power of God, personified, is the subject of the introductory verses of his Gospel. It is first said to be God, and afterwards declared to have become a man. It is first regarded in its relation to God, in whom it resides, and afterwards in its relation to Jesus, through whom it was manifested. Viewed in the former relation, what may be said of the Power of God is true of God; the terms become identical in their purport. Viewed in the latter relation, whatever is true of the Power of God is true of Christ, considered as the minister of God. His words were the words of God, his miracles were performed by the power of God. In the use of such figurative language, the leading term seldom preserves throughout the same determinate significance; its meaning varies, assuming a new aspect according to the relations in which it is presented. Thus an attribute may be spoken of as personified, then simply as an attribute, and then, again, as identified with the subject in which it resides, or the agent through whom it is manifested. In regard to the personification of the Logos by St. John, which is a principal source of embarrassment to a modern reader, it was, as I have said, inseparable from the terms in which the conception was expressed, the actions ascribed to the Logos being of a personal character, and the use of the neuter pronoun being precluded by the syntax of the Greek language.

.

“ In a note on the fourteenth verse, I have explained the

words, 'the Logos became flesh,' or 'the Power of God became a man,' as meaning that 'the power of God was manifested in a man,' that 'it was exercised through him,' 'it resided in him.' To one familiar with the uses of figurative language the interpretation may appear obvious. Some Trinitarians, however, may object to it as forced. I would, therefore, ask him who believes that by the Logos is meant the second person of the Trinity, to consider the exposition which he himself puts upon the words. According to this, the second person of the Trinity, the Son, who is himself God, became a man, or, to adopt the rendering of the Common Version, was made flesh. God became a man, or was made flesh. By the word rendered *became*, or *was made*, the Trinitarian understands to be meant, that he *was hypostatically united to a man*, was so united to a man *as to constitute with him but one person*. It is a sense of the Greek word *ἐγένετο* not to be found elsewhere; to say nothing of the meaning of the whole sentence, if it may be called a meaning, which results from giving *ἐγένετο* this unauthorized signification. The Antitrinitarian, on the other hand, understands the word as equivalent to 'became,' in that figurative sense in which we say that one thing is, or becomes, another, when it manifests its properties in that other thing so spoken of. He perceives as little difficulty in the language, as in that with which Thomson commences his Hymn on the Seasons.

'These, as they change, Almighty Father, these
Are but the varied God.'

As the Seasons are figuratively called God, because God in them displays his attributes, so the Logos is figuratively called a man, because in Christ were manifested the same Divine Power, Wisdom, and Goodness by which the universe was created.

“It is by no means uncommon to find in the same passage an attribute or a quality, now viewed in the abstract and personified, and then presented to the imagination as embodied in an individual or individuals. Thus Thomson, on the same page in the volume before me from which I made the last quotation, says : —

‘Heaven-born Truth

Wore the red marks of Superstition’s scourge.’

It is Truth considered in the abstract which is described as heaven-born or revealed from heaven ; it is those who held the truth who were scourged by Superstition. Other similar examples might be adduced. I will give one expressly conformed in its general character to the passage under consideration, in which no person accustomed to the use of figurative language will suppose that its proper limits are transgressed.

“ Goodness is seated on the throne of God, and directs his omnipotence. It is the blessedness of all holy and happy beings to contemplate her, the Supreme Beauty, and become more and more conformed to her image. It is by her that the universe is attuned, and filled with harmony. She descended from heaven, and in the person of Christ displayed her loveliness ; and called men to obey her laws, and enter her kingdom of light and joy. But she addressed those whom their vices and bigotry had made blind and deaf. She was rejected, despised, hated, persecuted, crucified.

“It may appear from what has been said, that the figure by which St. John speaks of the Logos as becoming a man, or, in other words, of Christ as being the Logos, belongs to a class in common use. But it might have been sufficient at once to observe, that analogous modes of expression are used even by Philo, though he regarded the Logos as a proper person. Con-

sidering the Logos as the agent of God in the creation and government of all, the being through whom God is manifested, Philo applies that name to other beings, the agents of God's will. In this use of the term, it may seem that, the Logos being viewed as the primal, universal manifestation of God, all particular manifestations are referred to it by Philo, as parts to a whole; — or the one Logos is supposed to act in every particular Logos, using all as its ministers. However this may be, he familiarly calls the angels 'Logoi' * (in the plural), and applies the term also to men. Thus he speaks of Moses as 'the law-giving Logos,' as 'the divine Logos,' and, when he interceded for the Israelites, as 'the supplicating Logos of God.' † Aaron is called 'the sacred Logos.' ‡ The same title is given to Phinehas, upon occasion of his staying the plague in the Jewish camp. § And the high-priest is repeatedly called 'Logos.' || Such language being common, the contemporaries of St. John would readily understand him when he spoke of the Logos becoming a man, or of Christ as being the Logos. When afterwards the Christian Fathers, regarding the Logos as hypostatized, supposed it to have become incarnate in Christ, they, of course, put a new sense upon the words of the Apostle.

"I MAY here take notice of a supposed analogy, which I believe does not exist, between the introductory verses of St. John's Gospel and those with which he commences his First

* De Posteritate Caini. I. 242. De Confusione Linguarum. I. 409, et alibi sæpe.

† De Migrat. Abrahami. I. 440, 449, 455.

‡ Legg. Allegorr. Lib. I. Opp. I. 59.

§ Quis Rerum Divinarum Hæres. I. 501.

|| De Gigantibus. I. 269. De Migrat. Abrahami. I. 452.

Epistle. In the latter by the expression rendered in the Common Version ‘word of life’ (λόγος τῆς ζωῆς), he intends, I think, merely the Christian doctrine, ‘the life-giving doctrine’; and has no reference to the philosophical notion of the Logos of God. This expression, and others similar, are used elsewhere in the New Testament in the same sense.* The commencement of the Epistle may be thus rendered:—

“‘What took place from the beginning,† what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we have beheld, and our hands have handled, concerning the life-giving doctrine;—for Life has been revealed, and we saw and bear testimony, and announce to you that Eternal Life which was with the Father, and has been revealed to us;—what we have seen and heard, we announce to you, so that you may share with us, whose lot is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ.’

“Notwithstanding the coincidence of some words, used in different senses, it is obvious that the purpose of St. John in the passage just quoted was wholly different from that which appears in the introduction of his Gospel. In the latter he intended to affirm, that the Christian revelation was to be referred to the same Divine Wisdom, Goodness, and Power by

* See Philippians ii. 16; Acts v. 20; John vi. 63, 68; Romans viii. 2, etc.”

† That is, ‘from the beginning of the Christian dispensation.’ The terms ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, or ἐξ ἀρχῆς, *from the beginning*, commonly occur in St. John’s writings in reference to the beginning of a period determined only by the connection in which the words occur. Thus in the second chapter of this Epistle, verse 7, he says: ‘Beloved, I write you no new commandment, but an old commandment, which you have had *from the beginning* [rather, *from the first*]. See also Epistle, ii. 24; iii. 11; Gospel, vi. 64; xv. 27; xvi. 4, etc.”

which the world was created and is governed. In the first verses of his Epistle he merely affirms, that what he had taught concerning this revelation rested upon his own personal knowledge, upon the testimony of his senses.*" — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 229 – 250.

For further illustrations of the doctrine of the Logos, see *Statement of Reasons*, Section X. pp. 251 – 288.

4. "In him was the source of blessedness ; and the source of blessedness was the light for man."

" 'Blessedness,' ζωή, rendered in the Common Version *life*. It is here, however, used in the sense of *blessedness*, as often in the New Testament. But the blessedness spoken of is that which is *communicated*, not that which is *enjoyed*, by the Logos. I do not perceive, therefore, that the sense of the original can be expressed more concisely in English than by the words which I have used. This blessedness is communicated through the revelation of religious truth, the intellectual *light* ; — not 'of men,' but 'for men.' In other words, the revelation made by the Power of God through Christ, which is the light of the moral world, is the source of blessedness to men." — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 244, note.

9. "The true light, which shines on every man, was coming into the world."

" 'The true light,' that is, the Power of God, the Logos ; so

" * There is a passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (iv. 12, 13), and another in the Apocalypse (xix. 13), in which the conception of the Logos, as an attribute or attributes of God, appears to be introduced, as in the introduction of St. John's Gospel. But it would not be to our present purpose to remark upon them further."

called because he is the source of the light, the revealer of religious truth." — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 244, note.

13 "— they being born not of any peculiar race," &c.

"Οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, literally, *not of (particular) races*, αἷμα being here used in the sense of *race*, as in Acts xvii. 26, and by profane writers. *Blood* in English is used in a similar sense; as in the expression, 'they were of the same blood.' The meaning of the whole thirteenth verse is, that the blessings of the Gospel were not confined to any particular race, as that of the Jews; and that none received them on the ground of natural descent, as children of Abraham and the other patriarchs." — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 245, note.

14. "And the Logos became a man, and dwelt among us, full of favor and truth; and we beheld his glory, such as an only son receives from his father."

"— became a man,' σὰρξ ἐγένετο, rendered in the Common Version 'became flesh.' The word σὰρξ, in its primitive meaning *flesh*, is often used to denote *man*. When it is said that the Logos, or the Power of God, became a man, the meaning is, that the Power of God was manifested in and exercised through a man. It is afterward, by a figurative use of language, identified with Christ, in whom it is conceived of as residing." — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 245, note.

For further remarks on this passage, see before, p. 338.

"And we beheld his glory, such as an only son receives from his father." See before, p. 29.

17. “For the Law was given by Moses, the Favor and the Truth came by Jesus Christ.”

“The Favor and the Truth,” ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια. These terms are here used to denote the Christian dispensation, the religion of mercy and truth.

21. “Are you the prophet?”

That is, most probably, the particular prophet whom the Jews supposed to be predicted by Moses in Deuteronomy xviii. 15–19. This prophet, it seems, was sometimes distinguished from the Messiah, as here and in ch. vii. 40, 41, though at other times he was identified with him, as in the use made of the passage of Moses by Peter, Acts iii. 22.

28. “This took place at Bethany, on the other side of the Jordan.”

There is here a diversity of reading between “Bethany” and “Bethabara.” The preponderance of authorities is in favor of Bethany. If this be the true name, the place here spoken of must not be confounded with the Bethany near Jerusalem.

29. “Behold, the lamb of God! he who is taking away the sins of the world!”

That is, Behold one who, perfectly pure himself, has come, as a messenger of God, to reform men from sin.—*MS. Notes of Lectures.*

31. “And I knew him not.”

It is evident from the words immediately preceding, as well as from what John had said the day before (verse 27), that he

could here mean only that Jesus was not *personally* known to him before his coming to be baptized. This fact is explained by the hermit-life led by John, who “abode,” says Luke (ch. i. 80), “in solitary places till the time when he showed himself to Israel,” and by the evident propriety that all concert, and all appearance of concert, should be avoided between him and our Lord. It was suitable for each to leave the other solely to the guidance of God.

41. “He first met his brother Simon.”

The force of the word “*first*” in this place cannot be determined.

51. “From this time forth ye will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending to the Son of Man.”

See Appendix, Note E, pp. 524, 525.

II. 1. “On the third day.”

That is, according to the meaning of this expression among the Jews, the day but one after Jesus set out for Galilee.

4. “Jesus said to her, Woman, why do you trouble me? My hour has not yet come.”

“At the marriage feast at Cana, when the mother of Jesus informs him that the wine is spent, there seems something harsh in his reply: ‘Woman, what have you to do with me?’”

“* Or, ‘why do you trouble me?’—It is thus that the words should be rendered, not, as in the Common Version, ‘What have I to do with thee?’”

'My hour has not yet come.' But it may be observed, in the first place, that the forms of courtesy, being arbitrary, vary at different times, and in different countries; and that to address one by the appellation of *Woman* was not considered disrespectful by the ancients.* By the words, 'What have you to do with me?' our Saviour undoubtedly intended to repress all interference of his mother with the exercise of his miraculous powers. Our conceptions of her are principally formed from the beautiful fictions of poetry and painting, in which

'holiest Mary bends

In virgin beauty o'er her blessed babe.'

There is, indeed, no reason to doubt the real excellence of her character; but there is as little doubt, that she entertained the common belief of her countrymen respecting a Messiah who was to be the greatest of princes, far more glorious than his ancestor, David. With this belief, trusting that her son was the Messiah, it was scarcely possible that she should not entertain hopes and feelings very inconsistent with what was really to be his fate and her own. The mother of the prince of Israel and of the world must have looked forward to something very different from a life of obscurity and suffering. Moreover, it was not in human nature that she should not have had some disposition to exert over her son the authority and influence of a mother. But, in the exercise of his office as the minister of God, it was impossible for him to yield to any human direction. The narrative we are considering implies that she wished him, on the occasion recorded, to make some display of his supernatural powers, or, at least, in some way to manifest himself as the Messiah; and it implies also that she had previously urged

* [See John xix. 26.]

him to do so. Without the last supposition, we cannot account for our Saviour's putting the sense which he obviously did upon the very slight intimation of his mother; nor for her subsequent direction to the servants soon after the discouragement she had received. It was to repress those feelings and dispositions of his mother which I have just described, feelings and dispositions which could only serve to aggravate her future sufferings, that our Saviour made the answer recorded. It was repelling, but it was intended to save her some of the anguish of disappointment; and the nature of his office rendered it necessary to repress all interference on her part. He was compelled to separate himself in some degree from her, both for her own sake, and because his duties were such as did not admit of his receiving her counsel, or being affected by her influence. He had, probably, announced to her before, that his ministry would be exercised in poverty and suffering, and terminated in a short time by a cruel death; and she, like his disciples at a subsequent period, had been unable to conform her mind to the comprehension and belief of what was so utterly foreign to all her previous conceptions respecting the Messiah. It is to his last sufferings that he alludes in the words, 'My hour has not yet come.'* His purpose in these words I conceive to have been to bring forcibly home to the mind of his

* The reasons for understanding these words in the sense above assigned are, first, that the expression is elsewhere in St. John's Gospel used in this sense, as in ch. vii. 30 (and so viii. 20), 'No one laid hands on him, for his hour had not yet come';—xiii. 1, 'But Jesus knew that the hour had come for him to pass from this world to the Father';—xvii. 1, 'Father, the hour has come':—and, secondly, because this sense suits with the connection and circumstances of the case, which no other that has been proposed seems to me to do."

mother what he had before declared to her respecting the intimate connection between his office and his death; and the brief interval which was to intervene between his assuming the former and his submitting to the latter. Their force is this: ‘Why do you urge me to manifest myself as the Messiah? The hour for my last sufferings has not yet come.’” — *Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, pp. 275–278.

6. “— two or three baths.” See the note on Luke xvi. 6.

13–17. (Expulsion of the traffickers from the temple.)

A similar event is recorded by the other Evangelists as having taken place near the close of our Saviour’s ministry. See Matthew xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15–18; Luke xix. 45–48; and compare the note on the passage of Matthew referred to. But there is no sufficient reason for supposing an error in regard to the date, either on the part of John, whose Gospel exhibits marks of particular attention to chronological order, or on that of the other Evangelists. The action here described may have been repeated by our Saviour on another occasion. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

19. “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.”

We must conceive of Jesus, in uttering these words, as presenting himself to his hearers in an attitude and manner so dignified and striking as to signify that they related to himself. The passage is analogous to that (Matthew xii. 6) in which he says, “One greater than the temple is here.”

III. 1 – 10. (Our Saviour's conversation with Nicodemus.)

See Appendix, Note C, pp. 505 – 509.

2. “Rabbi, we know that you have come as a teacher from God.”

The use of *οἶδαμεν*, “we know,” in this verse, and of the verbs in the first person plural in the eleventh verse, is to be noted, as the Evangelists do not customarily use the first person plural in the sense of the singular.

In this verse, by *οἶδαμεν*, “we know,” Nicodemus may be understood as including with himself others who thought with him. In the eleventh verse, where our Lord says, “We speak what we know, and testify to what we have seen,” he may be supposed to have connected with himself John the Baptist, who had been more conspicuous, and who, at the time when Jesus spoke, was, perhaps, equally conspicuous with himself. He and our Lord were both ministers of God in the same dispensation. John, like our Lord, was a preacher of the necessity of reformation, and of the duty of publicly professing by baptism the intention of commencing a new life; and the intimate connection of Jesus with him, as being about to complete the work for which he had made preparation, had been publicly announced. By “we,” therefore, we may understand our Lord as meaning the ministers of the new dispensation, John as well as himself; especially as, in what he had just said to Nicodemus, he had merely taught what in effect had been taught by John. — Compare Matthew iii. 15, where our Lord in a similar manner connects himself with John.

7. “Do not marvel at my telling thee, You must be born again.”

I have here (and in what precedes and follows) avoided the common English use of the plural form of the second personal pronoun *you* in the sense of *thou*. This use does not belong to the idiom of the Greek and Latin languages, and in order correctly to understand this conversation, it is important to distinguish between the use of the pronoun in the singular, addressed to Nicodemus individually, and its use in the plural, referring to the Jews in general.

10. “Thou art the teacher of Israel, and dost thou not understand this?”

“*The teacher of Israel.*” We may suppose Nicodemus to have been so distinguished as a teacher, that he had received this title from his disciples. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

11. “We speak what we know,” &c.

See the note on verse 2.

12. “If I tell you earthly things and you believe not, how will you believe should I tell you heavenly things?”

That is, If I tell you what an earthly teacher might tell you, and you believe not, how will you believe if I announce to you the higher truths connected with my mission from God, and those which I am commissioned to reveal?

13. “And no one has ascended to heaven, ex-

cept him who has descended from heaven, the Son of Man, who is in heaven.”

“Heaven being considered by the Jews as the local habitation of the Deity, ‘to ascend to heaven’ is here a figure used to denote the becoming acquainted with the purposes and will of God, with things invisible and spiritual, ‘heavenly things’; ‘to be in heaven’ is to possess such acquaintance; and ‘to descend from heaven,’ or ‘to come from heaven,’ is to come from God.” — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 179.

14, 15. “And as Moses raised on high the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of Man be raised on high, that whoever has faith in him may not perish, but have eternal life.”

Here our Saviour announces, though probably in such a manner as not to be fully understood by Nicodemus, his own future crucifixion, a fact wholly opposed to the Jewish expectations concerning the Messiah; and he teaches that the blessings to be communicated through his death would not be confined to the Jews, but would extend to *all* who had faith in him, — to all who should receive and obey his religion. — *MS. Lectures*.

16, 17. “For God so loved the world as to give his only Son,” &c.

This statement of the love of God *to the world* is made in opposition to the notions of the Jews, that God hated all nations but their own, and that the Messiah was about to come to make war and take vengeance upon them. The Messiah had come for a very different purpose “God did not send his Son into

the world to condemn the world, but that through him the world may be saved."

On the use of the term "the only Son of God," as applied to Christ, see the remarks from the Statement of Reasons before quoted, p. 29.

For further illustration of this passage, and of the verses which immediately follow, see Appendix, Note E, p. 521.

21. "But he who obeys the Truth comes to the light by which it is made manifest that his deeds are done in union with God."

The meaning of this verse is, that he who obeys the Truth becomes a Christian, and by the light of Christianity it is made evident that his deeds are the deeds of one united with God.

I have not given a verbal translation of the verse, because such a translation must be unintelligible to an English reader.

Instead of "he who *does* the Truth," I render "he who obeys the Truth," because the first expression does not belong to the idiom of our language.

Instead of saying, as in the Common Version, that his deeds "are wrought in God," I say, "his deeds are done in union with God." The former words convey no meaning. The preposition *ἐν* does not signify "in," but "with," that is, in union with. Thus it is often used by John in such passages as the following, where the sense has been wholly obscured by rendering it "in":—

Ch. vi. 56, "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood

abides with me [that is, “united with me” or “to me”], and I with him”; — x. 38, “Understand and believe that the Father is with me and I with him”; — xiv. 10, “Do you not believe that I am with the Father [united with the Father, as acting solely under his direction and through his power], and that the Father is with me? The Father, who abides with me, himself does the works”; — xiv. 20, “Then will you know that I am [united] with my Father, and you with me, and I with you”; — xvii. 20, 21, “I pray that they all may be one; that as thou, Father, art [united] with me, and I with thee, so they also may be one with us.”

And so in many other passages of John’s Gospel and Epistles. See John xi. 10; xii. 35; xv. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, etc.

The same use of language is common in the Epistles of St. Paul, particularly in such phrases as *ἐν Χριστῷ* and *ἐν Κυρίῳ*, meaning, not “in,” but “with,” “united with,” Christ, or the Lord.

The construction of the verse on which we are remarking is the same with that of verse 19 of the second chapter of John’s First Epistle. *Ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν · εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενέκεισαν ἂν μεθ’ ἡμῶν · ἀλλ’ ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν.* “They have left us, because they were not of us; for had they been of us, they would have remained with us; but thus has it been made evident that none of them were of us.” Here, as in the verse under consideration, *ἵνα* is used to denote a consequence which is not the purpose of the action spoken of, as it often is in the New Testament. And *φανερωθῶσιν* is explained by the clause following, introduced by *ὅτι*, which specifies the particular respect in which those spoken of were made manifest. There is the same construction in ch. iv. 9 of the Epistle, and in 2 Corinthians iii. 3.

24. "For John was not yet put in prison."

See Appendix, Note B, pp. 490, 491.

25. "Upon this, a dispute arose between the disciples of John and a Jew, about purification."

It is apparent that the moral purification connected with baptism is referred to. We may conjecture from what follows, that the particular question in dispute was, whether the baptism of Jesus was superior to that of John.

27. "John answered, A man can assume nothing but what is given him from Heaven."

Here, according to a rhetorical figure common in the New Testament and in other writings, a proposition is expressed in general terms, which is meant to be understood in a particular sense. The Baptist refers to himself. His meaning is, "I can assume nothing but what is given me from Heaven"; I can put forward no pretensions to be the rival of Jesus. It appears that his disciples had come to him with a feeling of jealousy, from the apprehension that Jesus was eclipsing and superseding their Master.

28. "I am not the Messiah, but one sent to precede that man."

"— to precede that man," *ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου*. According to the common use of the Greek pronoun *ἐκεῖνος*, it here refers not to the Messiah, but to Jesus.

29. "He who has the bride is the bridegroom.

But the friend of the bridegroom, who stands by and hears him, rejoices at the bridegroom's voice. This, then, my joy is accomplished."

There is here another general proposition with a particular sense. The meaning is, Jesus, who has the bride, is the bridegroom. To him I stand in the relation of the friend of a bridegroom. — In what follows there is, I believe, no allusion to any peculiar Jewish custom, nor any meaning but the obvious one.

31. "He who comes from on high is above all. An earthly teacher is of the earth, and speaks earthly things."

By "an earthly teacher," or, to render verbally, "he who is from the earth," is meant a mere human teacher; — who is contrasted with Jesus, who had come from God to reveal the truths of religion. See verse 12. See also Wetstein's note.

32. "What he has seen and heard, that he testifies; and no one is receiving his testimony."

That is, Though many are flocking to his baptism, (as is said in verse 26,) yet no one so comprehends the truths which he has been commissioned to teach, and is so affected by them, that he can be considered as receiving his testimony.

34. "He whom God has sent speaks the words of God. He gives not the spirit by measure."

"He gives not the spirit by measure." *He*, that is, Jesus. We cannot explain the omission of *ὁ Θεός* in several of the most important authorities, on the supposition that it stood in the

original text ; and to justify the rendering of the Common Version *αὐτῷ* is required. With the words as I have rendered them, compare Matthew iii. 11 ; John i. 33 and 16 ; vii. 37 – 39 ; xvi. 7, seqq.

IV. 3, 4. “He left Judæa, and went again to Galilee. And his way was through Samaria.”

Compare Matthew iv. 12, and see Appendix, Note B, p. 490

“And his way was through Samaria.” An explanation for readers out of Palestine.

8. “For his disciples had left him to go into the city to buy food.”

It appears from this that John was not present at this conversation with the Samaritan woman.

“His disciples had left him.” Jesus could not, therefore, through them procure the means of drawing water.

9. “For the Jews do not hold intercourse with the Samaritans.”

Another explanation for readers out of Palestine. So in verse 25.

10. “You would have asked him, and he would have given you living water.”

“*Living* water,” when the words are used literally, is distinguished by that epithet from water preserved in cisterns or other reservoirs. Our Lord, as is apparent, used the term figuratively. In order to perceive the exact force of his lan-

guage, it is to be observed that the words "him" and "you" are emphatic.

11, 12. "Whence then have you this living water? Are you greater than our father Jacob, who gave us this well?" &c.

How can you in this place get living water except from this well, which our father Jacob was obliged to dig in order to procure it?

"Are you greater than our father Jacob?" This question is not, I think, to be considered as referring merely to the words of Jesus, but as partly the result of the feelings of awe with which the woman had been impressed by his appearance and manner.

18. "You are right in saying, I have no husband; for, though you have had five husbands," &c.

For the construction, see the note on Matthew vii. 22, 23. The marriage tie being very loose among the Jews, it is probable that the woman had been separated from some or all of her husbands, not by death, but by divorce.

19-26. (Part of the conversation of Jesus with the Samaritan woman.)

[The conversation of our Lord with the Samaritan woman whom he found by Jacob's well has a bearing on the question whether the Levitical Law was of divine origin.] "To her he openly professed himself the Messiah, contrary to the reserve which he was compelled to maintain with the Jews till the closing scenes of his ministry. To her, likewise, he spoke with

more plainness in relation to the subject before us. She, believing him to be a prophet, questioned him at once respecting the fundamental point of difference between the Jews and Samaritans ; — whether God should be worshipped on Mount Gerizim, or at Jerusalem. About the form of worship, which was essentially the same in the temple of the Samaritans and in that of the Jews, there was no question in her mind. But it is to this form of worship that the answer of Jesus relates. ‘Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when ye shall worship the Father neither on this mountain, nor at Jerusalem.’ I pass over a sentence unimportant to our purpose. ‘The hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth. For indeed the Father is seeking such worshippers. God is a spirit, and they who worship him must worship him in spirit and truth.’ This passage, viewed in the light in which it has been placed by the preceding inquiry, hardly requires any comment. Those who worshipped, either at Jerusalem or on Mount Gerizim, according to the rites of the Levitical Law, were not such worshippers as God desired. Their religion of ceremonies was not the religion of the heart. Their form of worship was to be done away, as unacceptable to God ; and, in contradistinction to them, a new class of men was forming, through the ministry of Christ, who, rejecting all such rites, should worship God spiritually and truly.”

Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. II. pp. clxxx, clxxxi.

22. “Ye worship whom ye know not. We worship whom we know.”

I render δ by “whom,” not “what.” The irregularity of using the neuter gender for the masculine occurs elsewhere in John’s writings. See ch. vi. 37, 39 ; xvii. 2 ; 1 John v. 4.

27. “And upon this his disciples came, and wondered that he was talking with a woman.”

It was regarded by the Jews as highly improper to converse with a woman in public. See the quotations from the Rabbinical writers in Lightfoot and Wetstein.

Note the deference paid by the disciples to our Saviour in not questioning his conduct, though it so excited their astonishment. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

29. “Come, see a man who has told me all that I ever did.”

The language of the woman is not, I conceive, to be ascribed merely to the knowledge which Jesus had shown of the events of her past life, but to the whole impression produced upon her by his appearance and words.

30. “And they came from the city to see him.”

I supply the word “And.” It deserves notice, as showing St. John’s entire want of practice and skill in literary composition, that there is no connecting word in the original. Later transcribers have inserted the word οὖν, “then.”

35. “Say you not, After four months the harvest will come?”

The meaning is, Is it not a common proverbial expression at the commencement of an undertaking, “After four months comes the harvest”?

37. “In this is that saying true, One sows, and another reaps.”

Ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ, κ. τ. λ. I do not render γάρ, which refers only

to the distinction made in the preceding sentence between the sower and the reaper. Our use of “for” being more precise, such a reference would hardly be apprehended by giving this as the rendering of *γάρ*.

38. “I send you to reap where you have not labored. Others have labored, and you have come in their place.”

In this verse there may appear to be an example of St. John’s blending with the words which he reports words of his own, referring to events of a later date than the words reported. The Apostles of our Lord were not sent to commence their labors, nor even chosen, till after this conversation.

Perhaps, however, *ἀπέστειλα* is to be thus explained. When a mode of action, or an affection, is spoken of as resulting from the settled will or habitual disposition of the subject, this, according to an idiom of the Greek language, is commonly expressed by a verb in the aorist, which is to be rendered in English by the present tense. This is the use of the aorist which is explained by grammarians as denoting “what is customary,” or “what is wont to be done.” Conformably to this, *ἀπέστειλα* may mean, “It is my purpose to send.” See its use in ch. xvii. 18.

The word “others” — “others have labored” — seems to refer indirectly to all the means which God had before used to prepare men for the reception of Christianity, and directly to all the individuals who had been employed by him.

44. “For Jesus himself testified, that a prophet has no honor in his own country.”

The meaning of these words may be thus explained. Our

Saviour was by birth a Jew. He was a messenger of God to the Jewish nation. The principal seat of this nation was Judæa. But here he was not honored. He was compelled to leave Judæa through the enmity of the ruling men among the people, and to withdraw himself to the province of Galilee. He left those who were by eminence called the Jews, (they are so distinguished particularly by John,) and went to the Galilæans, whom those Jews despised. Compare verse 45.

The following passages afford examples of the distinction which John makes between the Jews, in the more exclusive sense of the word, that is, the inhabitants of Judæa, and the Galilæans: ch. v. 10–18; vii. 1–15; ix. 18, 22; xi. 8, 54. See also ch. vii. 52; xviii. 12–36; Matthew xxvi. 73; Mark xiv. 70; Luke xxii. 59.

45. Note the very loose expression, “all that he did”; and the explanation for Gentiles in the last clause.

48. “Cannot ye believe without seeing signs and wonders?”

These words of our Lord are left so unexplained by the Evangelist, that one cannot say with confidence what was their bearing. Perhaps the most probable explanation of them is the following.

It is to be observed that they were not addressed to the father individually. The use of the plural number in the original shows (conformably to what has been before observed in the note on ch. iii. 7) that Jesus spoke to a number of persons. I conceive that his words were not addressed to or understood by the father as applicable to himself. His object was obviously not that of seeing a miracle, he had shown no

want of faith, and he does not reply to them as if they had been addressed to him.

They imply that there were others present ; not improbably there were many others. Few among them, we may presume, had any confirmed faith in our Lord. He was at Cana, which was not far distant from Nazareth, a place from which a little time after he was rejected and driven out by the inhabitants. Those present who had no settled opinions concerning him and his divine authority were desirous of seeing him perform a miracle, and, we may reasonably suppose, had manifested their desire. In language like that which he attributes to the Nazarenes (Luke iv. 23) they may have expressed themselves thus : Do now, so that we may witness it, such a work as we have heard of your doing. The attestation of others to his miracles, confirmed by his character, appearance, and doctrine, had not been sufficient to produce conviction in their minds. In the question of Jesus, the word *seeing* is emphatic.

It seems, therefore, to have been one purpose of his words to bring into view the truth that sufficient evidence of his divine mission had already been given. They may be illustrated by what he said to Thomas : “ Because you have seen me, you have faith. Blessed are they who have faith without seeing.” On other evidence than that of sight, his countless followers after his death were to receive, and have received, the proofs that God was with him.

Our Lord, then, may be understood as meaning, that, though further evidence of his divine authority would be given in abundance, yet enough had been already afforded to remove all incredulity. His words, whether taken interrogatively as I have rendered them, or affirmatively as they may be understood, — “ Without seeing signs and wonders ye will not be-

lieve," — equally refer to the levity and incredulity of hearers not satisfied with evidence adapted to produce conviction, and requiring to see for themselves a display of his miraculous powers.

But I suppose they have still another bearing. Many who wished to see his miracles were influenced, no doubt, by mere idle curiosity. They had no comprehension of their true character, either as immediate works of God manifesting himself to men without the intervention of the laws of nature, as we call them, by which his operations are ordinarily regulated, or of the unquestionable evidence which they afforded of the divine authority of his minister. I conceive, therefore, that one purpose of the words of Jesus was to direct the attention of his hearers to the end for which those miracles were wrought, namely, as evidences of his divine mission. When he asks, *Cannot you believe without seeing a miracle?* — or affirms, according to the other mode in which the words may be constructed, *Without seeing a miracle you will not believe,* — he indeed implies that they might have attained assurance of his miraculous powers by other evidence than that of sight; but, at the same time, he directs their attention to the fact that his miracles were the ground of belief in him. They were not mere wonderful works adapted to produce astonishment, and having no purpose beyond the good immediately effected by them.

By speaking, as he did, of belief as properly founded on his miracles, he at once turned the thoughts of his hearers to the main purpose for which they were performed.

53. "And he and all his household became believers."

It is not an improbable suggestion which has been made, that

the officer of the court to whom John's account refers was Chuzas, a steward of Herod, whose wife is mentioned by Luke (ch. viii. 3) as one of the women who attended on Jesus.

V. 1. "After this there was a festival of the Jews."

The Feast of Tabernacles is probably the festival referred to. See Appendix, Note B, p. 492.

3. "In these lay a great number of diseased persons; blind, lame, withered."

After these words follows in many manuscripts a passage that may be thus translated:—

"— waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel at certain times descended into the bath, and troubled the water; then, whoever first entered it, after the troubling of the water, was cured of whatever disease afflicted him."

For the grounds on which this passage is to be regarded as probably spurious, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. Additional Note A, Section V. vii. pp. xci. — xciv.

16—30. (Discourse of our Saviour with the Jews after the miracle at the bath of Bethesda.)

"In the first part of the discourse of our Saviour with the Jews, recorded in the fifth chapter of John's Gospel (verses 16—30), which took place after he had excited their enmity against him by miraculously curing a man on the Sabbath, there are expressions as strong as are anywhere used concerning his authority as a minister of God, and concerning his religion as taught and sanctioned by God, as a promulgation of

the laws of God's moral government. The words of Christ were bold and figurative. The style of St. John, who has reported them, is in general obscure, except in mere narrative ; and the same style appears in his own compositions and in the discourses of our Saviour as recorded by him, which differ in this respect from those given by the other three Evangelists. It appears probable, therefore, that St. John, preserving essentially the thoughts uttered by his Master, conformed the language, more or less, to his own modes of expression. The passage, from these causes, is in the original somewhat difficult to be understood ; and in the imperfect and erroneous rendering of the Common Version, its bearing and purpose are scarcely to be discerned. As in similar cases, the obscurity thus spread over it has served to countenance the supposition that it involves some mysterious meaning. Yet, even as rendered in the Common Version, the passage, so far from affording any proof of the deity of Christ, presents only the conception of his entire dependence upon God.

“ In order to enter into its character and purpose, we must consider that the Jews in general, having little moral desert to recommend them to the favor of God, placed their reliance upon external ceremonies ; and among these there was none to which they attached more importance than a superstitious observance of the Sabbath. The majority of the Jews had that enmity toward Christ, which the bigots of a false religion always feel toward a teacher of the truth, who discloses the nothingness and the falsehood of their pretensions. As the descendants of Abraham, as performing ‘the works of the Law,’ which in their view were little more than the ceremonies of the Law, as God's chosen people, they considered themselves as holy, and looked upon Christ as a profane heresiarch. Their

feelings toward him were such as in the fifteenth century might have been excited among the members of the Romish Church, in any Catholic country, by one openly teaching, I do not say Protestantism, but pure Christianity, the essential truths of religion and morals, and fearlessly reproving the vices, superstitions, and hypocrisy of the age. They regarded him, as such a reformer would have been regarded, as an enemy of God; for if he were not at enmity with God, they were.

“In opposition to this state of feeling among them, our Saviour used the strongest expressions to declare that he was acting wholly under the guidance of God, and that his authority was the authority of God. It is an obvious remark, though it may be worth pointing out, that the expressions of the most absolute dependence upon God, and the boldest assertions of divine authority, amount to the same thing, and occur indiscriminately in his discourses. So far as he was a mere instrument in the hands of God, so far was his authority identical with that of God. These considerations will perhaps explain the general character of the passage we are considering.” — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 187 – 190.

16. “And upon this the Jews came in pursuit of Jesus, because he had done thus on the Sabbath.”

There seems to be no good reason for supposing, (with Kuinoel and Rosenmüller,) that the following account refers to a judicial trial before the Sanhedrim, nor, consequently, for taking the words *διώκω* and *ἀποκρίνομαι* in a forensic sense.

For remarks on our Saviour's disregard of the Jewish Law respecting the Sabbath, see *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. pp. clxxi, clxxii. Compare the note on Matthew xii. 1 – 8.

17, 18. "As my Father is continually working, so I also work," &c.

In these words our Saviour gave the Jews to understand that his connection with God resembled that of a son with a father. "My Father" is emphatic. Their further meaning may be thus explained. The operations of God are continually going on, equally during the Sabbath as other days; but I act by his authority, and in the exercise of his power; my works are in fact his works; there is no reason, therefore, why I should refrain from performing them on the Sabbath.

"The Jews did not familiarly speak of God as their Father; and when Jesus called him 'MY Father,' they understood him at once as meaning to express, that his relation to God was different from that of all other men. They understood, likewise, that he 'put himself on an equality with God,' in implying that he was no more bound by a regard to the law of the Sabbath than God, by whose authority he acted." — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 192.

In proof that the Jews did not regard the title "Son of God" as denoting any participation of the divine nature, see Matthew. xxvii. 43.

19. "The Son does nothing of himself, but only what he sees his Father doing. But what his Father does, the Son also does in like manner."

The verbal rendering of the first clause of this passage is, "The Son can do nothing of himself"; but this rendering, according to our use of language, conveys to an English reader the idea of natural impossibility; whereas the meaning intended is, that the Son is so entirely the minister of the Father, his

will is so conformed to the will of the Father, that his acts can be only in correspondence with the acts of God.

“But what his Father does,” &c. : — verbally, “*For* what he does,” &c. Here the force of *γάρ*, *for*, is to indicate that the proposition which it introduces is the ground of the preceding. But in English the purpose of *for* as thus used would not be obvious ; and the *essential* meaning of the two clauses is better brought out by using another word of connection, namely, *but*.

20. “And will direct him in greater works than these, to your astonishment.”

The expression, “his work,” or “his works,” as applied by Jesus to himself, is peculiar to John’s Gospel. Our Lord intends by it the whole work with which God had intrusted him, — all that he did in the accomplishment of his office as God’s minister. Among “his works” his miracles are of course included, but they are not specifically and exclusively denoted by that term ; though they are sometimes particularly referred to. Hitherto his agency had been confined to the Jewish nation, and had resulted only in exciting the attention of many, and in producing an imperfect faith in a few. This was all that he had as yet accomplished. But the effects of his ministry were not to stop here. They were to extend far beyond the Jewish nation. It was for the world that he taught, and acted, and suffered ; and multitudes of men were about to receive the truths which God had commissioned him to teach.

The spread of Christianity, its whole influence and bearing on the condition of men, he here ascribes to himself as God’s minister, through whom these results were to be effected. The language in this respect is of a similar character to that which

he often elsewhere uses. These results are what he here intends by his "greater works." They were wholly out of the conception of the Jews whom he was addressing, and were truly of a nature to excite their wonder.

Of the results of his ministry as extending to all men, he immediately proceeds to speak, dwelling upon its character, till he rises to the strong figure that all who are in their tombs shall hear his voice and come forth to be judged according to their deeds.

The office and agency of Jesus in the reformation of the world were before referred to by him in his conversation with Nicodemus, as what it would be so difficult for Nicodemus and his countrymen to comprehend. "If I tell you earthly things and you believe not, how will you believe should I tell you heavenly things?" These "heavenly things" are what are expressed in the declaration that follows, "God so loved *the world* as to give his only Son, that *whoever* has faith in him may not perish, but have eternal life."

In correspondence with the language which Jesus uses in the passage on which we have been remarking, he afterward (ch. xiv. 12) tells his Apostles, that they should do the works which he did, and "greater works." His personal ministry had been confined to the Jews, and the Jews as a nation had rejected him. "Their eyes had been blind and their minds darkened." He had made but few converts. It was by means of his Apostles that his religion was to be spread through the world. Their works, therefore, the effects produced by them, were in one sense greater than those immediately wrought by him. But these works, though they might be referred to them as the immediate agents, were ultimately to be referred to him, as the source of all that resulted from his ministry.

21. “For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will.”

“With ζωή, ‘life,’ in the New Testament, the idea of happiness is associated. ‘Eternal life,’ for example, denotes eternal happiness. The meaning of Christ, then, in these words may be thus expressed: The Father raises the dead to a new and happy state of being; but in this work he has appointed the Son as his minister, who by his religion affords the means of securing this blessedness, which will be conferred on all his followers without exception, as if by his own act and will.” — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 192.

22. “Nor does the Father condemn any one, but has committed all condemnation to the Son.”

“This language, it is obvious, must on any supposition be regarded as figurative. What was meant by it is, that Christ, being the teacher of that religion through which the laws and sanctions of God’s moral government are made known, might be regarded as the minister of God appointed to pronounce the sentence of condemnation on all exposed to it. He condemned only those whom God condemned, and he condemned all those whom God condemned. It is as such a minister that he afterward represents himself, when he says, ‘I condemn as I am directed.’ At the close of the discourse (verse 45), dropping this figure, he represents God in person as the judge who passes sentence. ‘Think not,’ he says, ‘that I shall accuse you to the Father. There is one who is accusing you, Moses, in whom you have trusted.’ In another discourse (ch. xii. 47, 48) he explains what is meant by him when he speaks of judging and con-

denning men. It signifies that men will be judged and condemned according to those laws and sanctions of moral conduct which he has made known to them in his religion: 'If any one who hears my words regards them not, I do not pass sentence on him; for I have not come to pass sentence on the world, but to save the world. There is a judge for him who rejects me and receives not my words;—THE DOCTRINE I HAVE TAUGHT, that will pass sentence on him hereafter.'

"In the discourse before us, our Saviour used the words on which we are remarking in reference to the Jews, his enemies, who considered themselves as secure of not being condemned by God, however their characters and conduct might be condemned by Jesus. It will be, he gives them to understand, as if all condemnation were committed to the Son." — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 192, 193.

24. "Truly, truly I tell you, He who hears my words and puts his trust in Him who sent me has eternal life, and shall not come under condemnation, but has passed from death to life."

"The punishment of sin is often represented in the New Testament under the figure of death. Death is regarded as the most severe of human punishments, and commonly apprehended as the greatest of the inevitable evils of our present state; except when this apprehension is done away by the faith and hopes of a Christian. To his view, indeed, it changes its aspect. To him it is a deliverance from the thralldom of this life, and a rapid and glorious advance in that course of progression and blessedness on which he has entered. It is no interruption of that ETERNAL LIFE which he has commenced

According to the common apprehension of death, 'he shall never die.' But to the sinner death appears under an opposite aspect. The natural dread of it is not alleviated by any rational hope of a happier life to follow it. On the contrary, it is the commencement of that state in which the tendencies of his evil dispositions will be more fully developed, and their consequences more bitterly felt. Now to the dispensations of the future life Christ always refers as the great sanctions of his religion. Death, then, being the termination of all sinful gratifications, and the commencement of future punishment, for this reason, in connection with those before mentioned, is employed, by an obvious figure, to represent the whole punishment of sin; and those who lie exposed to this punishment are, by a figure equally obvious, spoken of as already 'dead'; as the good are spoken of as already in possession of 'eternal life.' Thus too we may perceive why death, presenting itself under such opposite aspects to the one class and to the other, is represented, though common to all, as the punishment of the wicked." — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 194, 195.

25. "Truly, truly I tell you, that the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear it shall live."

"The discourse of our Saviour has been misunderstood from inattention to the causes why sinners are metaphorically called by him 'dead.' It has been thought to be on account of the deadness of their moral principles and affections. Hence some commentators have supposed, that there is in this discourse a series of harsh transitions, from the literally dead who are

raised to life by the Father, to the morally dead spoken of in the words last quoted, and then again to the proper dead 'who are in their tombs.' Others have explained the words just quoted as referring to the literally dead, who were raised to life by our Saviour during his ministry, though no corresponding meaning can be put upon his language immediately preceding, in which he speaks of those who have 'passed from death to life,' and the explanation is, at the same time, foreign from the purpose and connection of the discourse, and inconsistent with the antithetical opposition which runs through it between the two general classes, of the dead, and of those who have eternal life. Others still, by a far more extravagant interpretation, have understood Jesus, when he speaks of those in their tombs who shall hear his voice and live, to refer only to the morally dead, and, consequently, to describe only a moral resurrection. The true meaning of the words we are considering I conceive to be, that Christ had come to call sinners to reformation; that those who lay exposed to death *with all its fearful consequences*, 'the dead,' as they are figuratively called, would hear his voice; and that those who listened to it would be delivered from death as an evil, and have only to look forward to life and blessedness." — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 195, 196.

27, 28. "Because he is a son of man, marvel not at this," &c.

The meaning is, Do not marvel that I, though only a man, claim such connection with God, or that I claim to be charged with such a ministry by him, and to be intrusted with such authority from him, — for the character of my ministry may be announced in a manner still more striking. All men are, as it

were, to be called from their tombs by my voice, and to rise to blessedness or to condemnation, as they have obeyed or disobeyed those laws which I teach.

In connecting the words in the manner shown in the translation which I have given, their meaning is obvious, and suitable to the whole tenor of the discourse. As regards the more common rendering, "He has given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man," or "because he is a son of man," I know of no satisfactory or probable explanation of the latter clause. The absence of the article in Greek before the words rendered "son of man" forbids their being rendered "*the* Son of Man." The connection of the clauses which I have adopted is sanctioned by the Syriac translator of the New Testament, by Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus.

John could not have inverted the order of the clauses without producing ambiguity, on account of the recurrence of *ὅτι*, and its *common* use after *τοῦτο* as an explanatory particle.

See further, on this passage, Statement of Reasons, pp. 197, 198, and for illustrations of the figurative language here used, consult Appendix, Note E.

31. "If I bear testimony to myself, my testimony is not true!"

In these words it is evident, I think, that Jesus does not speak in his own person, but only repeats the language of the Jews, his enemies, language not improbably uttered on this very occasion, as we find it was on a subsequent occasion, when the Pharisees said, "You bear testimony to yourself; your testimony is not true": to which Jesus replied in his own person, "If I bear testimony to myself, my testimony is true." (Ch. viii. 13. 14.)

This was probably a standing, often-repeated objection of his enemies, since it admitted of such convenient condensation into a few plausible words. It could hardly have failed to occur to them after the declarations which he had just uttered. There is nothing in John's character as a narrator to justify us in supposing that what he has recorded as our Lord's discourse was all that was spoken on the present occasion. Such a discourse, especially under the circumstances which called it forth, could not have been delivered without those interruptions which, according to John's subsequent accounts, our Lord so often experienced; nor, consequently, without replies from him which John has not here given in the form of replies, but which he may have interwoven into an unbroken discourse.

After repeating this objection of the Jews, which was without doubt well known to Jesus, even if not made on this particular occasion, he appealed for their sakes, "that they might be saved," to the testimony of one whom they had generally held in the highest respect. What importance was likely to be attached by many to the testimony of John the Baptist appears from the fact that the chief priests and elders were silenced by the question which he put to them during one of the last days of his ministry. "Whence had John authority to baptize? From Heaven or from men?" (Matthew xxi. 25.)

35. "He was the burning and shining lamp."

The meaning is, that John had been *recognized*, and justly recognized, distinctively from all others, as a burning and shining light. The force of the article is to change the character of the proposition, from a simple affirmation of our Lord respecting John, into a reference to what had been his acknowledged character. Compare the note on ch. iii. 10.

37. “And thus the Father who sent me has himself borne testimony concerning me. You have never listened to his voice, nor seen his form,” &c.

Compare ch. x. 25, 37, 38 ; viii. 18.

A writer more attentive than John to the connections of thought would, I conceive, have used some other particle than the general and indefinite one, *καί*, “and”; as, for example, *ἵνα*, “so that.” But *ἵνα* nowhere occurs in John’s writings. His vocabulary of those terms which are used to denote the relation of one proposition to another is very limited. The difference between a practised and skilful writer and one who is unskilled appears particularly in the fact, that the former does and the latter does not accurately define the relations of his ideas by the use of suitable particles.

“You have never listened to his voice, nor seen his form.” These are bold, figurative expressions, to denote that those whom our Lord addressed were ignorant of the will and of the character of God ; — that they did not know him.

41, 42. “I desire not to receive honor from men ; but I know you, that you have not the love of God in you.”

The meaning is, But I know why you do not honor me : it is because you have not the love of God in you.

46. “If you had faith in Moses, you would have faith in me ; for he wrote concerning me.”

“Here, it may be said, is an express assertion of our Sav

iour, that ‘Moses wrote’; and, if we will not raise an idle cavil, grounded on the supposition that Moses may have written a part, but not the whole, of the Pentateuch, we must admit him to have been its author, and consequently admit that the Levitical Law proceeded from God.

“ But, on the other hand, it may be remarked, that to affirm that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch is, obviously, not the main purpose of the passage. Its *essential* meaning is, Had you received with true faith the religion taught by Moses, and had it produced its proper effect on your minds, you would have received me; for the dispensation by Moses concerned me; it was intended as a preparation for me.

“ It is next to be considered, that, in regard to the *incidental* meaning supposed to be expressed by the passage as it now stands, it rests on a single word. If, instead of the words, ‘Moses *wrote* concerning me,’ our Saviour in fact said, ‘Moses *taught* concerning me,’ (that is, What Moses taught concerns me,) then the declaration, without any change in its *essential* meaning, would suggest no such inferences as have been drawn from it. In order, therefore, to draw those inferences from it, we should be certain that St. John reported his Master’s language with verbal exactness. But it is not likely that he committed it to writing till many years after it was uttered; and it is altogether probable, that if, when he committed it to writing, the question had been proposed to him, whether our Saviour said ‘Moses wrote,’ or ‘Moses taught,’ or ‘Moses spoke,’ he would have been unable to solve the doubt. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose, that, of these expressions, all equally suitable to the *main purpose* of Jesus, he might not have remarked that there was reason for preferring one to another. It is to be recollected, that the fact is unquestionable, that the

Evangelists did not always report the language of their Master with verbal exactness.

“ But, supposing that the words before us are the very words of our Saviour, how are we then to regard them? We may regard them as an address *ad hominem*, as an incidental and temporary adoption of the conceptions and language of those to whom he was speaking, in relation to a subject foreign from his immediate purpose. We may understand him as if he had said, Had you believed Moses, you would have believed me, for the books which, *as you suppose*, Moses wrote, concern me. If it be asked, how those books concerned our Saviour, the answer is, that all the truths preserved in those books, derived from, or relating to, the revelation by Moses, concerned him for whom this dispensation was preparatory. Those books clearly taught that there was one God, the Creator of all things, ruling over all things, and exercising a moral government over men, — loving righteousness and hating iniquity. The foundation of all true religion was thus laid. He whose character had been formed on the belief of those truths was prepared to receive the truths taught by Jesus. The books preserving the traditions concerning Moses likewise presented in the strongest light the fact, that the Jews had been miraculously separated by God from other nations. The Jews believed, and reasonably believed, that this separation had been made for some great end, yet unaccomplished. They were expecting a new messenger from God to complete the work. This end was to be accomplished by Christ. He was the expected Messenger, — the Messiah. These, I conceive, are the reasons why the books ascribed to Moses concerned him. Whatever mixture of error they might contain, they still preserved the traditions of that earlier dispensation, the main purpose of which was to prepare

for his coming.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. pp. clxii. — clxiv.

Compare the note on Luke xxiv. 44 – 47. See also Appendix, Note D.

VI. 4. “It was near the time of the Passover, the Jewish festival.”

An explanation for Jewish readers. See also the first verse.

30. “What sign do you show us, that we may give you credit?”

This question may seem not a little extraordinary, after the many miracles of our Saviour, and especially after the very remarkable one which the multitude had witnessed the preceding day. But it appears from passages of the other Evangelists, that the Jews repeatedly demanded from him some sign of his being the Messiah, different from his common miracles, — “a sign from heaven”; that is, some appearance in or some sound from the heavens, or his causing the descent of something from the heavens to the earth. They had perhaps imagined that such miracles would attend their Messiah; or they might, from the fancy that the heavens were the local habitation of God, regard a miracle of this sort as coming from Him much more manifestly than one of any other kind. “The Pharisees and Sadducees,” says St. Matthew (ch. xvi. 1), “came to try Jesus by asking him to show them a sign from heaven.” This application is also mentioned by Mark (ch. viii. 11); and it appears from Matthew and Luke that a similar one had been made on a former occasion. (See Matthew xii. 38; Luke xi. 16.) Not satisfied, then, with the miracles of our Saviour, the

Jews demanded in addition to them a sign from heaven. This fact explains their question recorded by St. John, and explains likewise a passage in the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, in which he says, "The Jews demand signs, and the Greeks seek for wisdom." Neither the passage now in question, nor that of St. Paul, would be intelligible without a knowledge of this fact; though, when we do know it, we may perceive from what the Jews subjoin to their question which we are considering, that it was a sign of the character that has been mentioned which they had in view. They say, "What sign do you show us, that we may give you credit? What do you perform? Our fathers ate the manna in the desert; as it is written, *He gave them bread FROM HEAVEN to eat.*" The allusion in these last words, however, is not sufficiently clear to point out its object, if this were not already known to us.

I may here remark, that in the passages of St. John, and likewise in that of St. Paul, compared with what is recorded in the first three Evangelists, we have an instance of those coincidences which are found only in authentic writings, relating to real events. Neither John nor St. Paul ever mentions that the Jews demanded a sign from heaven, in contradistinction to other miracles; yet this is a fact which we find implied in a passage in the writings of each, as the only solution which renders it intelligible, and that such a demand was actually made we learn from other independent testimony. — *MS. Lectures.*

See also the remarks on Matthew xxiv. 30, in Appendix, Note E, pp. 528, 529.

33. "The bread of God is that which is now

descending from heaven and giving life to the world.”

“ ‘To descend from heaven,’ or ‘to come from heaven,’ is to come from God. In this sense the expression ‘to descend from heaven’ is used by our Saviour in his discourse with the Jews recorded in the sixth chapter of John’s Gospel. The Jews, whom he had disappointed the day before in their attempt ‘to make him their king,’ or, in other words, to compel him to assume publicly the character of the Messiah, according to their conception of it, had now collected about him with very different feelings. They were disposed to disparage his miracles in comparison with those of Moses. He had fed five thousand men with a few loaves and fishes ; but Moses, they said, quoting the Old Testament, ‘had given them,’ the Jews, ‘bread *from heaven* to eat.’ (Verse 31.) In what follows, this expression is used figuratively by our Saviour, to denote that his doctrine came from God, or, to express the same idea in other words, that he himself came from God. It was usual for him to draw his figures from something which had just been said, or some present object or recent event. ‘Moses,’ he says, ‘has not given you the bread from heaven’; meaning that Moses had not given them a religion like his own, adapted to supply all their spiritual wants ; ‘but my Father,’ he continues, ‘is giving you the true bread from heaven ; for the bread of God is that which is now descending from heaven and giving life to the world.’ By ‘the bread of God which gives life to the world,’ our Saviour here means his doctrines, his religion ; and with this, by an obvious figure, common in the New Testament, he afterwards identifies himself. ‘I am the bread of life ; he who comes to me will never hunger, and he

who has faith in me will never thirst.' (Verse 35.) 'I have descended from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of Him who sent me' (verse 38); — that is, I who bring this religion from heaven have no other purpose but to perform the will of God." — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 179, 180.

36. "But, as I have said to you, though you have seen me, you have not had faith."

. "As I have said to you": — see verse 26. Though they had witnessed his miracles and his ministry, they had no true belief. There is perhaps an implied comparison between the evidence which they had of the divinity of his mission, and that of the mission of Moses, of whom they had only heard, but whom they had opposed to him. — *MS. Lectures*.

37. "All whom the Father is giving me will come to me."

The expression, "All whom the Father is giving me," may be illustrated by comparing it with another which our Saviour uses a little after (verse 44): "No one can come to me unless the Father, who sent me, draw him," — that is, No one can come to me, no one can become my true follower, except under the influence of those motives which God applies to the minds of men to lead them to their duty. All those who are thus brought to him he speaks of under the figure of being given to him by God.

It is characteristic of the style of Scripture to refer that immediately to an agent which is the consequence more or less remote of his actions; often where this consequence is designed, and sometimes where it is not designed, by him. Many things

in like manner, are referred *immediately* to God as their author, which take place through the intervention of means. Thus, as all those who were influenced by the motives which God was proposing to men would come to Christ, their coming to him is attributed immediately to God, and they are spoken of as being given by God. All those who were governed by these motives acted conformably to the will, and enjoyed the favor, of God; and it is this truth, that his followers were approved by God, particularly and exclusively, — exclusively in respect to others who had enjoyed similar advantages, — which it was the principal object of our Saviour to impress upon the minds of the Jews in using the language we are considering, and other similar expressions in this discourse. They who received him were acting under the guidance of God; they who rejected him were acting in opposition to it. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

41, 42. “Then the Jews murmured at him because he said, I am the bread which has descended from heaven. And they said, Is not this man Jesus, the son of Joseph? one whose father and mother we know? What then does he mean by saying, I have descended from heaven?”

“We have no reason to suppose that they understood him as meaning that he, being a man, had descended from heaven; or that he, being a pre-existent spirit, had assumed a human form. Their objection was to the absolute authority which this man, Jesus, the son, as they called him, of Joseph and Mary, claimed as the delegate of God. They had the same feeling as was shown by his fellow-townsmen of Nazareth, when they asked: ‘Is not this man the carpenter, the son of Mary, and

kinsman of James and Joses and Judas and Simon?' (Mark vi. 3.)" — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 181.

44. "No one can come to me, unless the Father, who sent me, draw him."

I have before explained what I suppose to be the meaning of the figurative expression, "to be drawn by God." (See the note on verse 37.) Every one, our Saviour tells the Jews, who is drawn by the Father, who is under the influence of those motives by which God draws men to himself and to moral goodness, will come to him. No one can come to him unless he be under the influence of such motives. The inference which he leaves them to make respecting their own character and condition, is sufficiently plain. By "being taught by God," by "listening to the Father and learning from him," in what follows, our Saviour intends the making a proper use of all the religious knowledge and privileges, of all the means and motives, which God had been bestowing and employing, — the receiving of that religious instruction which he had been in so many ways conveying to their minds. Every one who does this, he says, comes to him. From the metaphor which he had been using, our Saviour takes occasion to make one of those declarations of his peculiar intercourse with God, which were so necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose of his ministry, and which were particularly required when his claims were, as at present, doubted or denied. He declares that his connection with God is different from that of all other men, and of a far higher character. "Not that any one," he says, "has seen the Father," — not that any one has learned immediately and directly from the Father, — "except him who is from God; he has seen the Father"; he has derived his knowledge immediately from God. — *MS. Lectures*.

51-56. "I am the bread of life which has descended from heaven ; if any one eat of this bread, he shall live for ever," &c.

"As food is the means of prolonging the natural life, so the religion of Christ was the means of enjoying eternal life. Metaphors of a similar kind, derived from taking food, and applied to the partaking of what is desirable, the being compelled to endure what is painful, or the experiencing the consequences, good or evil, of our own conduct, occur elsewhere in the Scriptures, and are probably common in most languages. In such metaphors, however, as well as in other figurative modes of speech, the Oriental style passes beyond the limits within which we are confined. Thus, in Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom is personified, and represented as saying: 'Those who eat me shall yet be hungry, and those who drink me shall yet be thirsty.'* Thus too in the Talmud, R. Hillel, who asserted that the Messiah had already come, is said to have been opposed by other doctors, who maintained that 'the Israelites were yet to eat the days of the Messiah.' He on the contrary affirmed that 'they had eaten their Messiah in the days of Hezekiah.'†

"But in the words following those last quoted from our Saviour's discourse, there is an accession to the figure. It becomes a vehicle for expressing a new fact. He says: 'But the bread which I will give is my body, which I will give for the life of the world.' In this language, he refers, I conceive, to his own death. He goes on: 'Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you have not life within you'; and he

* Chapter xxiv. 21

† See Wetstein's note on John vi. 51.

repeats and insists upon this strong figure. When he thus describes the food of life, of which his followers were to partake, as his own flesh and his own blood, the only purpose, I believe, of this amplification of the figure is to show that the blessings to be enjoyed through him were to be purchased by his violent death. It was, I think, so understood, at least partially, by those who heard him. His object was to destroy all hope of his establishing a splendid temporal kingdom, such as the Jews had been expecting; and thus to repress all worldly motives in those who were inclined to be his followers. Their Master was not to be a conqueror and a monarch, as they might have hoped, dispensing honors and favors to his adherents and countrymen; the sacrifice of his own life was required, a bloody death was to be suffered by him, in order that his followers might enjoy those blessings of which he was the minister. So, as I have said, he appears to have been understood; and many of his followers in consequence deserted him." — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 182, 183.

57. "As the living Father sent me, and I live through the Father, so he who eats me will live through me."

The meaning appears to be this: — As God, whose existence is underived, sent me, and as I live in a peculiar manner through him, performing all my works by his immediate power, and acting in all my ministry only as the instrument of his will, so he who receives me will through me, that is, through my religion, live for ever. — *MS. Lectures*.

For a somewhat different explanation, see *Statement of Reasons*, p. 30, note.

61, 62. “Does this give you offence? What, then, if you should see the Son of Man ascending where he was before?”

In these and the following words, Jesus is remarking upon, and in part explaining, what he has before said. The purport of the words is this: Does it offend you that I speak of my death? Would your offence continue, should you see me after my death ascending to heaven?

It may be that Jesus here referred to his ascension from earth and disappearance from the view of his disciples. But if he did so, that miracle was, I conceive, present to his mind only as a proof and visible emblem of what he principally intended in his words. What he principally intended was his return to God from whom he came, after passing through his sufferings and death.

It is to be remarked, that, here and elsewhere, the expressions “coming from” and “descending from” heaven or God, which are founded on Jewish conceptions of heaven as the local habitation of the Deity, are in their nature necessarily figurative, and do not admit of being taken in a verbal sense. God is in no one place rather than in another. There is no portion of space that may be designated as heaven on account of its being his peculiar habitation. “To be in heaven,” or “to be with God,” does not denote existence in any particular place. “To descend from heaven,” or “to come from God,” does not imply previous existence in any particular place. So to understand such expressions is to take words necessarily figurative in their literal meaning.

“Enoch *walked with God*”; — “Their cry *went up to God*”; — “The spirit *shall return to God* who gave it”; —

“Draw *near* to God”; — “God *has departed* from me”; — “O God, *be not far from me*”; — “God will hear him *from his holy heaven*”; — “Look *down from heaven*, O Lord”; — “The Lord’s *throne is in heaven*”; — “Whom have I *in heaven* but thee?” — “God *sent me before you*”; — “I (the Lord) *send thee to the children of Israel*”; — “Let us *return to the Lord*, and he will *come to us*.” In these passages, and in numberless others of a similar kind, we perceive how the imperfection of human conceptions and of human language has led to the use of expressions equally figurative with those of “descending from,” and “ascending to,” heaven and God.

The expressions above quoted are from the Old Testament, but they are such as are familiarly used in popular language at the present day. We do not find among them those harsher figures and ruder conceptions which elsewhere are not uncommon in the Jewish Scriptures.

In John’s own writings, and particularly in his reports of the discourses of our Lord, there is much language of a similar kind. “There was a man [John] *sent from God*”; — “The only Son who is *on the bosom of the Father*”; — “Ye will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending to the Son of Man”; — “The Son of Man who is *in heaven*”; — “The Father has not *left me alone*”; — “I speak what I *have seen with my Father*”; — “I speak to the world what I *have heard from Him*”; — “There are many rooms in my Father’s house; I am going that I may prepare a place for you”; — “He who has seen me has seen the Father”; — “Whoever loves me will obey my words; and my Father will love him, and we *will come to him, and make our abode with him*”; — “I *came from the Father into the world; now I am leaving the world, and going to the Father*.”

As the conceptions which we finite beings form of the Infinite Being must be inadequate and imperfect, so a great part of our language concerning him is necessarily inadequate and imperfect, and naturally assumes a figurative character. Such, of course, is particularly the case with popular language. This is full of modes of speech addressed to the imagination and feelings, but of a different character among different nations. It abounds more with figures, and becomes more remote from literal truth, in proportion as it expresses, or is conformed to, the conceptions of unphilosophical thinkers, — of such a people as the Jews. A great mistake will be committed, if from the multitude of these figures we pick out one made remarkable, perhaps, by being particularly remote from our modes of expression, and impose upon it, not the literal meaning of the words, for this may be impossible, but some imaginary, mystical meaning, which is too obscure to offend us by presenting an obvious absurdity.

Our Lord, in the passage before us, and where he speaks of descending from heaven, conforms his language to the conception of the Jews, that heaven was the peculiar abode of God. But we cannot receive this conception as true, and therefore cannot understand the words in their literal sense.*

It may be thought, however, that his declaring himself to have descended from heaven was intended as an affirmation of his pre-existence, for that by "heaven" is meant a portion of space where beings of a higher order than man reside. By "heaven" I conceive that, in the proper sense of the word, we mean that future state of blessedness on which the good will

* [The remainder of this note is from an imperfect draught, which had not been revised by the author.]

enter after death, and in which, as we have no reason to doubt, those who have been connected on earth may be near each other. But there is no rational foundation for the opinion, that those beings who are of a higher order than man exist within the limits of a certain definite portion of space which is to be called heaven.

Nor would our Lord's supposed declaration of his having been a pre-existent spirit, an angel, or an archangel, or some being of a still higher order, have anything to do with the occasion and purpose of his discourse. It could have tended only to bewilder the minds of hearers who, without this new difficulty put before them, were already confounded by his actions. The immediate occasion of the discourse was the necessity of repressing and destroying, as far as might be, the worldly passions and expectations of the Jews arising from their false notions of the temporal reign of the Messiah. Its purpose was to direct their thoughts to the true grounds of his authority, not as a warrior and earthly king, but as a teacher sent from God and speaking in God's name ; — to the character necessary in his followers, who were not to be bold partisans of a temporal prince, but to do the works which God required ; — to the blessings which would be conferred upon them, not such as might be looked for from a triumphant leader, but eternal life ; — and to the means by which this blessedness was to be procured for his followers, not by his success as a conqueror, but by his sufferings and bloody death.

Among these thoughts there could be no propriety in his introducing the supposed doctrine that he himself was a pre-existent being. On the contrary, here, as in his other discourses, he keeps himself individually out of view. He is to be obeyed, not because he is a being in his own nature far

superior to man, but because he is the minister of God. He speaks of no authority derived from what he was in himself, but of the authority conferred on him by God.

Nor does it appear that even the Jews so mistook or perverted his meaning as to put a literal sense upon his words. When he told them that he was "the true bread from heaven," "the bread of life," "the bread of God which was descending from heaven and giving life to the world," it was impossible for the Jews or any other hearers not to recognize that all these expressions were figurative, and especially, that by "descending from heaven," as used concerning the bread of God, could be meant nothing more than "coming from God." The turns of expression here employed are metaphors borrowed from the account given in the Psalms of the manna, as bread rained from heaven (the visible heavens) to preserve the lives of the Israelites. (See Psalm lxxviii. 23 – 25.) We cannot reasonably suppose that the Jews imagined our Lord to affirm that he had descended from the visible heavens in a bodily shape, or thought of his claiming to be a pre-existent spirit, coming from those abodes of the blessed which we call heaven. (Compare the note on vv. 41, 42.)

* * * * *

As has already been remarked, the expressions "to come from God" and "to descend from heaven" are synonymous. (See John iii. 2, 13, 31.) They both denote the appearing among men as a minister of God miraculously authorized by him. "To go to heaven" and "to go to God" are at the present day perfectly familiar expressions, but equally figurative with those on which we are remarking. They mean, to pass from this life to a higher state of existence, in which God will confer new happiness on the good.

* * * * *

In speaking of himself as having descended from heaven, the meaning of our Lord is the same as when in this discourse he repeatedly designates himself as "him whom God has *sent*." "*I have descended from heaven*, not to do my own will, but the will of Him who *sent* me." (Verse 38 ; compare vv. 29, 39, 40, 44, 46, 57.)

* * * * *

Thus far, in explaining the metaphor by which Jesus represents himself as the bread descending from heaven, we find nothing which is not analogous to our own forms of expression. But in the words particularly under consideration a figure occurs, which, though it is used by writers of the Old and New Testament, and other ancient writers, Christian and Jewish, has not found a place among our modes of speech. It is connected with less philosophical conceptions of God than those which Christianity has taught us to entertain. In the use of this figure, events and persons and states of being, which it is intended to refer in the strongest manner to the appointment of God, and to represent him as having especially predestined, are spoken of as having a proper existence while yet existing only in his foreknowledge and purpose. I have elsewhere explained the design of this figure, and given many examples of it. See the notes on John xvii. 5 and viii. 58. It is one which occurs repeatedly in the language of our Lord, as his language is reported by John ; as when he says, "And now, Father ! glorify me with thyself, giving me that glory *which I had with thee before the world was*." "Thou didst love me *before the foundation of the world*." (Ch. xvii. 5, 24.) In like manner, his being and office being predetermined by God before the world was, he here speaks of himself as having existed with God before his appearance on earth.

63. “What is spiritual gives life. The flesh profits nothing,” &c.

“Our Saviour here goes on, contrary in some degree to his usual custom, to explain in part the figurative language which he had used. ‘The flesh profits nothing’:—that is, my flesh would profit you nothing; ‘the words which I speak to you are spiritual, and give life.’” — *Statement of Reasons*, p. 184.

65. “Hence I told you, that no one can come to me, unless it be given him from the Father.”

“Unless it be given him from the Father.” That is, Unless it be under the influence of those motives and impulses, of whatever kind, by which God acts upon the minds of men to bring them to virtue. No one can truly become my follower from such mere worldly and mercenary considerations as have governed many of those who have joined themselves to me. — *MS. Lectures*.

See vv. 37, 44, with the notes.

66. “After this, many of his disciples fell away, and accompanied him no longer.”

There is something particularly interesting in the remainder of the relation of St. John respecting this discourse. The mind of our Saviour appears to have been affected and oppressed with a sense of the indocility, perverseness, and folly, the low passions and the selfish desires, of those whom he had been addressing. He appears to have felt as he did on another occasion, when he uttered the words, “Unbelieving and perverse race! how long shall I be with you? How long must I bear

with you?" He turns to the Twelve and inquires of them, "Would you also go away?" St. Peter, with his characteristic ardor and attachment to his Master, answers him, "Master, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life; and we believe and know that you are the Holy One of God." The mind of our Saviour recurs again to the unworthiness of those with whom he was obliged to be conversant, and he recollects that even of that small number whom he had selected to be constantly near him, to witness his miracles and his life, and to hear his instructions, there was one so insensible to everything which ought to affect the heart and the understanding, that he was about to be his betrayer. Was it strange, then, that others deserted him, and that the multitude were so little affected by his preaching? "Have I not chosen you Twelve for myself?" he says, "and *one of you* speaks evil of me."

There is often a degree of beauty in the narratives of St. John, from their apparent fidelity and truth, which is to be found in few other histories. He gives not unfrequently that distinct impression of the discourses and actions of our Saviour, which he would not have himself received if he had not been an observer of more than common sensibility. In many of his accounts of transactions, he not only affords us a view of the main facts, but presents them with those minute circumstances, which, like the changes of the countenance, often discover more of character, and more of the movements of the mind, than express words or actions. — *MS. Lectures.*

70. "And one of you speaks evil of me."

I understand the term in the original, *διάβολος*, according to its primitive and common signification, in which it denotes "one

that speaks evil of another," "a slanderer." In this sense, used with the article, ὁ διάβολος, "*the Devil*," it was applied by the Jews pre-eminently to Satan. But it is not used in any sense derivative from and analogous to this application of it without the article or in the plural number, so that it can be translated "a devil" or "devils."

The rendering of the Common Version, "and one of you is a devil," is not only incorrect, but creates a great difficulty, since it is hard to conceive that Judas should have remained in the company of the Apostles after having been thus denounced by their Master. It is evident from what is afterward related (ch. xiii. 21, seqq.), that there had been nothing in the conduct of Judas, or in the manner in which he had been spoken of by our Lord, to determine that, if any one of the Apostles was a traitor, it must be he.

VII. 2. "The Jewish festival called the Feast of Tabernacles."

A mode of expression adapted to Gentile readers.

5. "For not even his kinsmen had faith in him."

"His kinsmen": — that is, some even of his kinsmen. I conceive the meaning to be, not that they disbelieved his divine commission and were his enemies, but that they doubted about his character and office, and had not yet professed themselves his followers. — *MS. Notes of Lectures*.

18. "He who speaks from himself seeks his own glory; but he who seeks the glory of him who sent him is true, and in him is no iniquity."

The last part of the sentence is a general proposition with

a particular meaning, the sense being, But I, who seek the glory, &c. See the note on ch. iii. 27.

“And in him is no iniquity.” This was said by our Lord with direct reference to the false and injurious notions of the Jews concerning him. It is a declaration immediately connected with what follows, in which Jesus proceeds to speak of an act that the Jews regarded as in a high degree sinful, namely, his healing the diseased person at the bath of Bethesda on the Sabbath, and his directing him on that day to take up his bed and walk. See ch. v.

22, 23. “Moses has given you circumcision, — not that it comes from Moses, but from the fathers, — and you circumcise a child on the Sabbath,” &c.

“Considering the manner in which circumcision is represented in the Pentateuch as having been ordained and enforced, there is something well deserving attention in the words in which our Lord first refers it to Moses, and then to the fathers, as if it were, at most, a mere ordinance of Moses, or a traditional rite of the Jews, sanctioned by him. He does not speak of it as appointed by God. ‘If a child,’ he proceeds, ‘be circumcised on the Sabbath, that the Law of *Moses* may not be broken,* are you angry with *me*’ for what I have done? The word ‘me’ is here emphatic. The sentence is antithetical. The question belongs to the class of those passages in which our Saviour demanded for himself deference like that, or greater than that, which the Jews had been accustomed to pay

“* As a child, according to the Law, was to be circumcised on the eighth day after its birth, the rite was performed on the Sabbath, if that happened to be the eighth day.”

to those whom they most honored under their old dispensation; as when he said, ‘A greater than Solomon is here’; — ‘Before Abraham was born, I was He’; — ‘Have you not read what David did?’ But if we follow the Pentateuch in referring the rite mentioned, not to Moses, but to God, as its proper author, the language becomes altogether unsuitable. We shall at once perceive this by substituting for ‘the Law of Moses’ an expression corresponding to that conception: ‘If a child be circumcised on the Sabbath, that the *Law of God* may not be broken, are you angry with *me*?’ — ‘Are you angry with me,’ our Saviour goes on, ‘for restoring soundness to the whole body of a man?’ In these words, the antithesis between the act which he had performed and the act performed in circumcision represents the latter, not as a sacred and most important rite, but as a mere mutilation of the body.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. pp. clxxiii, clxxiv.

34. “Should you seek for me you will not find me, and where I shall be you cannot come.”

In regard to the construction, see the note on Matthew vii. 22, 23. See also the note of Grotius on this verse. Compare ch. viii. 21; xiii. 33.

35. “Will he go to the Greeks who are scattered about?”

By “Greeks” I conceive to be here meant Greek proselytes; on whom the proper Jews of Jerusalem looked down as an inferior class. They were scattered about in various places out of the limits of Palestine. The verbal rendering is, “Will he go to the dispersed Greeks?” These proselytes appear to be here called “Greeks” by the irritated Jews, as their least honorable

appellation. But that proselytes might be so called without an expression of disrespect may appear from ch. xii. 20, and the note on that verse.

38. "From him who believes in me will flow, as the Scripture says, rivers of living water."

Perhaps the allusion of Christ is to the common metaphorical language of the Old Testament in which blessings are represented under the figure of rivers and abundance of water. So Psalm xlv. 4: "There is a river the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God." [See also Isaiah xlv. 3:—

"I will pour water upon the thirsty land,
And streams upon the dry ground.
I will pour out my spirit on thy children,
And my blessing upon thine offspring."

Noyes's Translation.]

Perhaps he refers particularly to the commencement of the thirty-second chapter of Isaiah: "Behold! a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule with equity. Every one of them shall be as streams of water in a dry place." Some, as Rosenmüller and Kuinoel, suppose the reference to be to Isaiah lviii. 11: "Thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not."

The same figure was used by the Rabbins. See Schoettgen and Kuinoel.—What our Saviour's words express is, that his followers would overflow with spiritual blessings themselves, and be the means of imparting them to others.

Ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ is merely equivalent to the English words "from within him." See the illustrations of its use in Kuinoel.

39. "This he spoke of the Spirit that believers

in him were to receive ; for the Holy Spirit was not yet given, Jesus not having yet been glorified.”

By “the Spirit” is here meant the power of God producing correct notions of the spiritual character of Christianity, and thus rendering its influence upon men’s hearts and lives far more efficacious. It is of the Spirit, as thus understood, that Christ speaks in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters of this Gospel, as about to be given to his Apostles after his ascension. His representation in this particular corresponds to, and explains, what is here said by St. John : “The Holy Spirit was not yet given ; Jesus not having yet been glorified.”

53 – VIII. 11. (The story of the woman taken in adultery.)

“The narrative of the woman taken in adultery is omitted in many copies, and marked as doubtful or spurious in so many others, that, reasoning on the principles that have been laid down, we may conclude with confidence that it was not written by St. John. But I perceive no ground for questioning the truth of the account ; it is related in a striking and natural manner, and bears an intrinsic character of probability.

“There are, in different copies of this narrative, great variations of language, expressive of the same essential meaning. This may be accounted for in several ways. We may suppose that the story was first written in some other language than the Greek, and translated into this by two different hands ; or that, being first written in Greek, and then translated into Latin, it is found in some copies, as the Cambridge manuscript for example, retranslated from the Latin into the Greek ; or, what is, perhaps, as probable a solution as any, that it was written down

in Greek by two different individuals, from the oral narration of St. John, and afterwards appended to his Gospel, in which it had not been inserted by himself. The passage may be thus rendered, according to what are, perhaps, the most probable readings :—

“ ‘ And every one went to his house ; and Jesus went to the Mount of Olives. But in the morning he was again in the temple, and all the people came to him ; and having sat down, he was instructing them, when the teachers of the Law and the Pharisees brought a woman taken in adultery, and, placing her in the midst, said to him, Teacher, this woman was taken in the very act of adultery ; and in the Law, Moses commands us that such should be stoned to death ; what now do you say ? This they asked with a design to ensnare him, that they might have an accusation against him. Then Jesus, bending down, wrote with his finger upon the ground. But, as they persisted in questioning him, he raised his head and said to them, Let him among you who is without sin cast the first stone at her. And bending down again, he wrote upon the ground. And hearing this, they went out one by one, beginning with the oldest, and Jesus was left alone with the woman standing in the midst. Then Jesus, raising his head, said to her, Woman, where are they ? Did no one sentence you ? She said. No one, Master. Then Jesus said to her, Neither do I sentence you ; go and sin no more.’ ” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. pp. xciv, xcv.

VIII. 17. Note the expression “*your* Law.”

18. “ I, who bear testimony to myself, am He.”

The usual mode of rendering this passage cannot, I think, be

justified. If we regard the words $\delta \muαρτυρῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ$ as the predicate of the proposition, this will admit only of the following sense : “ I am he who bears testimony to himself.” With reference to the construction, compare ch. iv. 26.

21. “ I am going away, and you will seek me, and you will die in your sin.”

“ You will seek me.” The elliptical and imperfect style of John has left this expression undefined. But there seems no doubt that the meaning is, You will seek me *in vain*; I shall be removed from you. This corresponds to the parallel passage, ch. vii. 34, and to the words which here immediately follow.

25. “ Jesus said to them, In the first place, I am in all respects as I speak to you.”

The verbal rendering of the last clause is, “ I am whatever also I speak to you.” I conceive the meaning to be, I am what I appear to be from my discourses to you. My character and office are made evident by them. I speak to you in them as an authorized messenger from God. I am what their whole tenor shows that I claim to be, and evinces that I am.

* * * * *

Explain that $\lambdaαλέω$ cannot be used for $\lambdaέγω$, — and also why Jesus could not explicitly declare himself to be the Messiah.

* * * * *

28. “ When you have raised on high the Son of Man,” &c.

Compare ch. iii. 14; xii. 32.

32. "And you will know the Truth, and the Truth will make you free."

The Jews "were expecting that the Messiah would deliver their nation from subjection to the Romans. But it was another sort of freedom that he promised them through the knowledge of the Truth."

"It was through this channel alone, through the Truth, that the blessings of God communicated by the great Benefactor of our race were to be conveyed to mankind. On the last day of his life, that day of agony and triumph, he pronounced the declaration, 'I was born for this end and for this end have I come to the world, to bear testimony to the Truth.' He came to bear testimony to that truth, religious truth, which underlies all other moral truth, and which alone concerns man in his permanent relations, his relations to God and eternity. It was for the establishment of that truth that God manifested himself through Christ. It was by the name of 'the Truth' that our Lord designated his religion, thus identifying it with all that it most concerns us to believe." — *Tracts concerning Christianity*, p. 228 and p. 227.

See John xiv. 6; xvi. 13; xvii. 17.

38. Observe that, to give the true sense clearly, the metaphorical language of the original must be altered. Note the use of *οὐκ*.

40, 41. "This Abraham would not have done. You do the works of your father," &c.

That is, Instead of doing such works as were done by Abraham, who was your natural progenitor, but sustains no other

relation to you which the name of father might imply, you do the works of him who may be called your father from your resemblance to him. By this indefinite, unexplained mention of “your father” here and in verse 38, Jesus prepares the way for, and renders more effective, the terrible denunciation in which he explains his meaning in the use of the term.

“We have one father, God.” The Jews, who had just before asserted, in a literal sense, that Abraham was their father, now adapt their answer to the obviously figurative style used by Jesus, and, in conformity with it, affirm that God is their father.

43. “Why do you not understand my language? Because you cannot listen to my teaching.”

This question refers to the perverse misconception, or unintentional misunderstanding, of our Saviour’s meaning by the Jews, which appears in the preceding account of his discourse, and often elsewhere. It refers, I think, more particularly, as may appear from what follows, to their not understanding him when he spoke of “their father.”

“Because you cannot listen to my teaching”; — that is, “because you cannot *even* listen”; because your passions and prejudices are such, that you cannot listen with any patience or attention to my teaching, so as to apprehend its character and purport.

44. “Your father is the Devil,” &c.

Here, and in what follows, Jesus borrows a figure from the common Jewish conceptions concerning Satan, but his language is not throughout conformed to those conceptions. He means by “the Devil” the principle of moral evil. Possessed as his

enemies were by this principle, they might be called, according to their own conceptions, children of the Devil. This prompted them to seek his destruction ; as it had, from the beginning, been the cause of murder. This prevented them from adhering to the Truth. It was inconsistent with any love of truth. This led them to speak falsely of him ; for this was the source of the whole system of falsehood by which the Truth was opposed. In figurative language this was its father.

The words “lie” and “liar” should not be used in rendering the words of Jesus. There are strong associations of coarseness, contempt, and insult with those words as used by us, which do not belong to the corresponding words in the ancient languages. But, without reference to this fact, the rendering “when he speaketh a lie” is incorrect. The definite article is used in the original with a purpose essential to the meaning.

By “*the* Truth,” as before explained, is meant the whole system of truths taught by Jesus. By the term in the original, τὸ ψεῦδος, (rendered in the Common Version “a lie,”) verbally, “*the* falsehood,” is meant the whole system of falsehood opposed to the Truth. But we cannot express this in English by saying “the falsehood,” and are compelled to use a periphrasis.

I have said that the language of Jesus is not throughout conformed to the conceptions of the Jews concerning the Devil. This appears in the words, “He adheres not to the Truth, because there is no truth in him.” The Jews conceived of Satan as a real person. But no one can imagine that our Lord meant to assert of Satan, as a real person, that he did not adhere to the true religion, and to give a reason for it. The meaning of his words, as before explained, is that the power of moral evil,

working in those whom he addressed, prevented them from adhering to the Truth, from becoming his followers, by destroying all love of truth.

“For he is false, and the father of all such falsehood.” It has been said by Middleton, in his work on the Greek Article, that *ὁ πατήρ* cannot be the predicate of a proposition, as I have rendered it, because it has the article; and, if the predicate of a proposition, it should be without it. But this remark proceeds on a mistake which appears in other parts of his book. There is no difference, certainly no essential difference, between the use of the article in Greek and of the definite article in English before the predicates of propositions. When the predicate expresses a character peculiar to the subject of which it is affirmed, then it has the article, except when this character is such that it *can* belong only to an individual, in which case the article may or may not be used. When it expresses a generic character common to others, then it is without it. There are at least thirty instances of predicates with the article in the preceding part of John’s Gospel.

46. “Who of you convicts me of sin?”

“— of sin”: — that is, of anything inconsistent with the character of a teacher of true religion. Compare ch. vii. 18.

55. “I know him, and am directed by him.”

The last clause is, verbally, “I keep” or “obey his word”; but this verbal rendering expresses the original so indistinctly in English, that it is better to drop the form of expression, and to give a rendering which conveys the meaning clearly in our own language.

56. "Your father Abraham exulted that he might see my day; and he saw it, and rejoiced."

"Abraham exulted that he might see my day":—I suppose the meaning to be, "that he was permitted to see my day."

"And he saw it." The future blessing to be conferred on men through one of his posterity was revealed to him and made present to his mind by God.

58. "Before Abraham was born, I was He."

"The rendering of the Common Version, 'Before Abraham was, I am,' is without meaning,—the present tense, 'I am,' being connected with the mention of past time, 'before Abraham was'; and this circumstance has doubtless assisted in producing the belief, that the words express a mystery. But our Saviour says, that Abraham saw his day, that is, the times of the Messiah. This declaration no one understands verbally, and there is as little reason for giving a verbal meaning to that under consideration. In the explanation of it two things are to be attended to.

"In the first place, after the words *ἐγὼ εἶμι*, rendered in the Common Version, 'I am,' we must understand *ὁ Χριστός*, 'the Messiah'; as is evident from two preceding passages in the same discourse. In verse 24, Jesus says, with the same ellipsis, 'Unless you believe that *I am* [that is, *that I am the Messiah*], you will die in your sins'; and in verse 28 he tells the Jews, 'When you have raised on high [crucified] the Son of Man, then you will know that *I am*,' meaning, *that I am the Messiah*. The same ellipsis occurs repeatedly in the Gospels and Acts, as, for instance, in Mark xiii. 6 and Luke xxi. 8 we find the words, 'Many will come in my name, saying *I am*'; while in

Matthew xxiv. 5 the ellipsis is supplied, 'Many will come in my name, saying, I am the Messiah.' Other examples are referred to below.*

.

"In the next place the verb *ἐμί* is here to be understood as having the force of the perfect tense, that is, as denoting, literally or figuratively, a state of being commenced at a distant time and continued to the present. It is thus elsewhere used in St. John's Gospel. 'Have I been [*verbally*, Am I] so long with you, and yet have you not known me, Philip?' (Ch. xiv. 9.) But such is our use of language, that this meaning is here to be expressed in English by the imperfect tense, 'I was.' If we should say, 'Before Abraham was born, I have been,' the idea of uninterrupted continuance of being to the present time is so far from being conveyed, that it is rather excluded.

"The full meaning of Jesus, then, was this: Before Abraham was born, I was the Messiah; that is, I was designated by God as the Messiah. The words cannot be understood verbally, because 'the Messiah' was the title of one bearing an office which did not exist till it was assumed by Jesus on earth. Before Abraham, there was no Messiah except in the purpose of God. The language used by Christ is of the same figurative character with that which we find at the commencement of the prophecy of Jeremiah, as addressed to him by God (i. 5): 'Before I formed thee in the womb, I knew thee; and before thou camest forth at thy birth, I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet to the nations.'" — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 175 – 179.

* Acts xiii. 25 (comp. John iii. 28); John iv. 26; xiii. 19." For an explanation of this apparently strange ellipsis, see *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 176 – 178.

Among the abundance of figurative language used by the Jews concerning the Deity, it was common for them, in reference to any object or event which they meant to represent as having been determinately ordained by God, to speak of it as having existed from the beginning, or before its appearance or occurrence on earth. It existed, according to this mode of conception, in the mind of God. Of such use of language I have elsewhere produced examples. (See the note on John xvii. 5.) This is one of the passages in which it was the purpose of Jesus strongly to impress the Jews with a sense of the high authority which he claimed, by representing himself as equal or superior to those whom they most venerated among their progenitors. Compare the note on John vii. 22, 23.

59. "But Jesus was screened from them."

As we may suppose, by his disciples, and others not unfriendly to him, who gathered round him.

IX. 2. "Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?"

For proof that the Jews believed in pre-existence, see Schoettgen's note on 2 Cor. v. 2. (*Horæ Hebr.*, Tom. I. pp. 693 – 703.)

"Midrasch עֲלֵיךְ ad Canticum Cantic., fol. 54, 3: 'Quum homines nondum nati sunt, habent vestitum, quo vestiti sunt spiritus ad modum corporum hujus mundi.' " Schoettgen gives another long quotation to the same purpose; and then quotes "Sohar Exod., fol. 5, col. 20: 'Quando spiritus hominis induitur vestitu imaginis in corpore hujus mundi, tunc sic dicit Deus: Ex paradiso egredere, spiritus.' " — Schoettgen, pp. 693, 694.

"Judæi omnes animas, antequam in corpora immigrant, in

loco quodam, quem $\eta\gamma\eta$ vocant, versari dicunt.” — Schoettgen, p. 702.

Josephus says that the Pharisees believe, “that the soul is indestructible, that the souls of the good pass into another body, but that the souls of the wicked are subjected to eternal punishment.” (De Bell. Jud. Lib. II. c. 8. § 14.) In the eleventh section of the same chapter he ascribes the doctrine of pre-existence to the Essenes. In his Antiquities (Lib. XVIII. c. 1. § 3) he states the belief of the Pharisees to be, “that souls have an immortal vigor in them; that under the earth there are rewards and punishments for them, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and that for the bad there is an eternal prison appointed; but for the good an easy return to life, $\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu$.” Probably by the good and bad the Pharisees understood Jews who kept the Law, on the one side, and Heathens and apostates, on the other.

On this subject see Brucker, Hist. Crit. Philosophiæ, Tom. II. p. 753, seqq. Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, Liv. IV. c. 13.

Our Saviour, it is to be observed, did not explain to his disciples the mistake implied in their question. See Appendix, Note E, p. 550.

3. “This man was not born blind on account of his own sin, nor his parents’; but that the works of God might be apparent in him.”

Verbally, “Neither this man sinned, nor his parents; but that the works of God might be apparent in him.” This is a specimen of the unfinished style of the Evangelist. A similar ellipsis occurs ch. i. 8; xiii. 18; xiv. 31; xv. 25; and in the First Epistle of John ii. 19. See also Mark xiv. 49.

“The works of God.” I suppose “works” to be used in the plural in order to refer the blindness with which the man was born, equally with his miraculous cure, to the immediate will of God. If so, these words continue and complete the answer of Jesus to the question of his disciples. The man was born blind, because such was the will of God.

4. “I must work the works of Him who sent me while it is day. The night is coming, when one cannot work.”

The meaning is, I have but a short period for my ministry, in which I must accomplish what God has given me to perform.

“— when one cannot work”:—verbally, “when no one can work.” This is another example of a general proposition to be taken in a particular sense; the meaning being, “when I cannot work.”

With this verse and the following are to be compared the words of Jesus in the ninth verse of the eleventh chapter, which are illustrated by those before us. In both cases the circumstances were such as to bring forcibly to his mind the near termination of his ministry. He was now about to do what would exasperate all those feelings of his enemies which had been excited against him by his previous discourses. He was about to perform an act, accompanied by circumstances intended to give it publicity, by which he would manifest his disrespect for their superstition in regard to the ceremonies of the Levitical Law, and particularly concerning the outward observance of their Sabbath,—an act of the same kind with that related in the fifth chapter, which, according to the account there given, he performed at the hazard of his life.

6. “He spat on the ground, and made clay with the spittle, and smeared with it the eyes of the blind man.”

This mode of performing the miracle seems to have been adopted by our Saviour for the purpose of directly meeting and opposing the prejudices and superstitions of the Jews. There are two passages in the Talmud in which it is forbidden to put spittle upon the eyelids on the Sabbath ; and the same thing is repeated by Maimonides. (See Lightfoot, Wetstein, and Kuinoel.) This was done by Christ ; and, at the same time, the man was sent to the bath of Siloam, the purpose of which we may suppose to have been to give notoriety to the miracle by increasing, as would be natural, the number of witnesses. See Kuinoel.

Note the explanation of the word Siloam for Gentile readers.

9. Observe the use of *ἐγὼ εἶμι*. See the note on ch. viii. 58.

27. Note the use of *ἀκούω*, a remarkable example of the rude style of the Evangelist.

34. “And they thrust him out.”

That is, from the place where they were assembled.

35. “Jesus heard that they had thrust him out.”

Jerusalem being a place of narrow extent, and our Lord being particularly interested in what was going on, he probably heard of the result of the blind man’s examination in a very short time.

These are remarks so obvious, that perhaps, as in the case of some which I have made before, it would not be worth while

to put them forward, were it not for the obscurity which translators and commentators have spread over the passage.

36. “He answered, And who is he, Sir, that I should have faith in him?”

It does not appear that the blind man had ever before *seen* Jesus; or rather, it appears that he had not.

39. “And Jesus said, I have come into this world to make a difference between men.”

“— a difference between men,” *εἰς κρίμα*, — verbally, either “for judgment,” that is, to judge between men, or, “for discrimination,” that is, to discriminate between them; but either sense is expressed by the rendering given.

The words in this and the remaining verses to the end of the chapter were not spoken, as I conceive, in immediate sequence with what precedes. And so, also, I believe that the words in the first six verses of the next chapter should be separated from those which precede them, and likewise from those which follow them in verses 7 – 18.

X. 3. “For him the door-keeper opens.”

“The door-keeper”: — the person, as we may conceive, appointed to watch the fold by night, keeping the door fast.

7, 8. “Again, Jesus said to them, Truly, truly I tell you, I am the door to the sheep. All who have come are thieves and robbers; but the sheep did not listen to their voice.”

In these verses, as in other reports given by the Evangelists of the words of Jesus, the figurative language, though it con-

tinues to be derived from the same objects as that which precedes, changes its aspect, and is differently applied. Having before spoken of himself (as he does immediately afterward) under the figure of a shepherd, he here speaks of himself as the door of the fold.

“I am the door” : — that is, Through me all the truths and blessings of religion are to be communicated to the flock, or people of God. Whoever addresses them as an authorized teacher must enter through me.

“All who have come [before me] are thieves and robbers.” In this declaration, as given by the Evangelist, it is evident that the expression is, at least for a modern reader, imperfect and obscure. But the words “all who have come” refer directly to the imagery in the first verse, and imply the assertion that those had come who had not entered by the door, but had clambered over the wall into the fold. Jesus intended those among the Jews, the more bigoted of the Pharisees and teachers of the Law, who had assumed to be the religious guides of the people, and who opposed their own bad passions and thoroughly false conceptions of religion to the truths taught by him. But to them the flock, the people of God, did not listen.

There can be little doubt that the words *πρὸ ἐμοῦ*, “before me,” which are wanting in many authorities, are a marginal gloss that has been taken into the text.

By “the flock” or “the sheep” we are not to understand any particular individuals who had at this time professed themselves followers of our Lord. The terms were used by him in a general and abstract sense, to denote all those whose characters qualified them, or might qualify them, to be his disciples. Such would not be led away by the bad passions and false teaching of his enemies.

9. "I am the door ; whoever enters through me will be safe, and coming in and going out will find food."

"Whoever enters through me will be safe." Here again the aspect of the figurative language is changed. In the seventh verse Jesus calls himself the door, because through him the blessings of religion were communicated. Here he calls himself by the same name, because through him men were to be admitted to those blessings. The two conceptions are ultimately the same, being but the same truth presented in different forms ; but they lead to different thoughts and to a different use of language in connection with the one or the other.

"And coming in and going out will find food." This may seem, at first view, a mere amplification of the figure, without any very definite meaning. But "to come in and go out" was an idiomatic expression familiarly used by the Hebrews to denote all the actions of a man. It occurs often in the Old Testament. Thus in Psalm cxxi. 8 it is said, "Jehovah will defend thee when thou goest out and when thou comest in" ; and in Deuteronomy xxviii. 6, "Blessed shalt thou be when thou comest in and when thou goest out." The meaning, therefore, is what may be expressed by saying, "and he will be blessed in all his ways."

For an explanation of the idiom in this verse, see the note on Matthew vii. 22, 23.

16. "And other sheep have I, which are not of this fold ; those too I must bring in," &c.

See Appendix, Note E, p. 522.

17. “My father shows his love for me in this, that I lay down my life to receive it again.”

Jesus had spoken of laying down his life for his flock. The truth, that the blessings conferred on men through him were to be communicated to them at the cost of his life, was often presented by him to his hearers. But this truth was wholly repugnant to the Jewish conceptions concerning the Messiah. It was equally foreign from their notion that temporal prosperity and adversity were marks of the favor and displeasure of God. “How can God love him, how can he be the Messiah,” his enemies might ask insultingly, and his friends might ask doubtfully, “if, as he says, he is about to lose his life?” It is not improbable that these feelings were expressed at this time. Whether they were or not, Jesus must have been aware of their existence. It was to meet them that he says, in proof of his being loved by God, that he lays down his life to receive it again; that he lays it down of his own accord; and that he both lays it down and receives it under a commission from his Father.

In regard to the construction of this passage, we are, I conceive, to understand λέγω ὅτι, “I say that,” before ὁ πατήρ με ἀγαπᾷ, “my Father loves me.” The ellipsis supposed would be readily supplied in an animated discourse, when both the hearers and the speaker had the same subject in mind.

22. “It was winter” is an explanation added for Gentile readers.

25. “I have told you, and you do not believe.”

I have told you in effect; I have sufficiently given you to understand.

28, 29. Note the strange effect produced by aiming at verbal translation in the Common Version, Wakefield, and Campbell.

30. "I and my Father are one."

That is, my sheep are the sheep of God, whose minister I am, my works are his works, my words his words, my authority his authority, my followers his followers.

The meaning of Jesus was so obvious, that it does not appear that the Jews either misunderstood or perverted it. The cause of their offence was the same as that by which they had been before (ch. v. 18) so strongly excited, that "he had spoken of God as particularly his father." "Do you say that I speak blasphemy," Jesus asks them, "because I called myself the Son of God?"

35, 36. "If those are called gods to whom the word of God was addressed, (and this Scripture cannot be set aside,) do you say to him whom the Father has consecrated and sent into the world, You speak blasphemy; because I called myself the Son of God?"

The words of Jesus are not to be considered as a justification of his use of language. The passage has the same character and purpose with others before noticed, in which he asserts his superiority over those most conspicuously mentioned in the Old Testament.

The words, "I said, Ye are gods," are taken from **Psalm lxxii. 6**, where they stand thus connected. —

“I said, Ye are gods,
And all of you sons of the Most High.”

In quotations from the Old Testament it was not uncommon with the Jews to give only the commencement of a passage, when they intended to bring the whole of it to mind. The Psalm was addressed to the rulers among the Jews. The meaning of Jesus, therefore, was, If your rulers were formerly called “gods” and “sons of the Most High,” can the title “Son of God” be denied to one who is so far their superior, one whom God has consecrated and sent into the world? Has he not a right to speak of God as his Father?

On the use and meaning of the term “Son of God” as applied to Christ, see the note on Matthew iii. 17.

XI. 1 – 5. Note the very inartificial style of narration in the first five verses.

2. “This Mary was the same who anointed the Master with precious oil,” &c.

That is, who afterwards did it. See ch. xii. 3. Note the manner in which St. John here refers to this incident, as a fact well known to many of his readers.

9, 10. “Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day? He who walks in the day will not stumble; for he sees the light of this world. But he who walks in the night will stumble; for the light is not with him.”

These words of Jesus are, I conceive, to be thus explained.

The disciples had just referred to the great danger to which

he would expose himself by returning to Judaea. But in this danger they felt that they should share with him. They apprehended that, by venturing again among the Jews, they themselves, as well as their Master, would put their lives to hazard. This state of mind appears in the expression of devoted attachment uttered by Thomas, "Let us also go, to die with him."

To these fears of his disciples the words of Jesus relate. In familiar metaphors, he speaks, as he had done before (ch. ix. 4), of his ministry as of a natural day, having a determinate period, not to be accelerated, and of himself as the light of the world. While his ministry continued, while this light was with them, his disciples had no reason to fear for themselves. When it should be withdrawn from them, then would they be in darkness, and the time of their trials and sufferings would come.

This thought is the same which we find often elsewhere in his discourses ; as, for example, in Matthew ix. 15 : "The days are coming, when the bridegroom will be taken from them, and then will they fast." So also in what he says in Luke xxii. 35–37. And this view of the change in the condition of his disciples which would follow his removal from them is strongly presented in his last discourse before his death, ch. xv. 18, seqq., xvi. 1, seqq.

The metaphorical language used in this passage is illustrated by what we find before, ch. ix. 4, and afterward, ch. xii. 35, 36 ; and by all those passages in which Jesus is designated as "the light of the world," or by similar metaphors.

11. "Our friend Lazarus has fallen into a sleep."

The ambiguity in the words of Jesus being preserved, they should be so rendered as to imply in one sense that Lazarus

had fallen into a sleep which was a crisis in his disease ; a long symptomatic sleep. His disciples could not have understood him as speaking of a common sleep, when, at such a distance as he was from Bethany, he proposed going to awake him.

19. Note the expression *πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίας*, as indicating the acquaintance which John had acquired with classic Greek. It is, I think, the only example of the idiom in the New Testament.

25. “I am the resurrection and eternal life.”

Verbally, “the life,” but this expression in English conveys no distinct sense. The meaning is, I am *the* life which follows the resurrection, eternal life.

For some remarks on this passage, see Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, pp. 254, 255. See also the Appendix to this volume, Note E, p. 521.

30. “Jesus had not yet entered the town.”

The tomb being without the town, Jesus waited where he was, to go to it.

33. “Then Jesus struggled with himself and was troubled.”

“Struggled with himself” : — that is, “with his own feelings.” The words verbally rendered are, “chid” or “rebuked his spirit.” The meaning is, that he repressed his emotions by a strong effort.

Note the unusual expression *ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*, “he troubled himself.” I cannot find that it is used anywhere else. The meaning seems to be, “his own emotions troubled him.”

39. "By this time the body is offensive."

It is a pity that this most striking narrative should have been marred in the Common Version by the coarse rendering given of this passage, which there is nothing in the original to require or justify. The word there found, ὀζει, being applied equally to agreeable and disagreeable smells, has no such unpleasant associations with its use.

44. "And the dead man came forth, with his limbs swathed, and his face bound round with a cloth. Jesus said to them, Loose him, and let him go away."

We have here evidently the description of an eyewitness, recollecting how he was himself affected by the appearance.

The rendering of the Common Version, "bound hand and foot," is incorrect; since these words can properly mean nothing else than that his hands and his feet were respectively bound together, but this the words of the original do not express. Nor have we any knowledge of the Jewish modes of treating the bodies of the dead in the time of Christ, which may justify us in supposing that they were such that Lazarus would be prevented by his bandages from moving out of the tomb on his return to life.—It may be remarked that our whole direct information on the subject is derived from the New Testament.

"Loose him, and let him go away." The purpose of the last direction was to cause Lazarus to be withdrawn from the great excitement which must have prevailed among the multitude around him.

47 – 52. (The council held by the Jews ; the speech of Caiaphas, and John's remarks upon it.)

There is nothing improbable in supposing that the Evangelist may have gained by report some general knowledge of what was said at the council which he mentions ; and the words ascribed to Caiaphas are natural, and likely to have been spoken by him.

Jesus had placed himself in open opposition to the Pharisees, and to the leading men among the Jews. Caiaphas, and his other enemies in the council, feared that the common people would receive him as the Messiah, thus destroying all their authority and consideration ; that they would, in consequence, rise in rebellion, and that the vengeance of Rome would thus be brought on the nation. Toward a Messiah such as they might conceive of, endued with equal powers, but connecting himself with them, and professing to be the deliverer of the nation from the Roman yoke, their feelings would have been altogether different.

John says, that Caiaphas “spoke under a divine impulse” ; for this is here the proper meaning of the word rendered in the Common Version “prophesied.” In so saying, he gives only his own opinion. In representing Jesus as dying for “the nation,” he expresses, I conceive, his belief that the benefits of the ministry of Jesus would finally extend to the Jews ; that this great interposition of God, connected with all his previous dispensations toward them, would terminate in their deliverance. As, during his lifetime, the great body of the Jews had been unbelievers, and, before the composition of his Gospel, the nation had in consequence been desolated, he could not refer to any blessings which the Jews, as a people, had already received from the ministry of Jesus.

We may remark the proofs which this short passage affords, that the writer was a Jew ; — in the supposition that the Jewish high-priest, of however depraved a character, might speak under a miraculous, divine impulse ; in designating the Jews as “ *the nation* ” ; and in expressly observing that Jesus died “ not for the nation *only*.”

54. “ Jesus went to a town called Ephraim.”

Ephraim appears to have been a town in the mountainous country north of Jerusalem. Eusebius says, according to the present reading of his text, that it was eight (Roman) miles from Jerusalem. Jerome says, that it was between nineteen and twenty miles from Jerusalem, “ in vicesimo ab Æliâ milliario.” Dr. Robinson (in his *Harmony of the Gospels*) gives probable reasons for supposing that its site was that of the modern et-Taiyibeh, on a mountain about nineteen Roman miles north-northeast from Jerusalem, overlooking the valley of the Jordan at about twelve Roman miles’ distance from the river.

55. “ But the Passover of the Jews was nigh.”

“ The Passover of the Jews ” : — an expression for Gentile readers.

XII. 1. “ Then Jesus, six days before the Passover, came to Bethany.”

There is an hypothesis, to be hereafter remarked on more particularly (see the notes on ch. xviii. 28 and xix. 14), that John supposes our Lord to have been crucified on the day of the Passover, the fourteenth of Nisan, not the day after ; representing the Passover not to have been on Thursday, but

on Friday. The statement that our Lord arrived at Bethany six days before the Passover has a bearing on the question. If we suppose that he arrived at Bethany on Friday, this would be six days before the Passover, supposing the Passover to have been on the Thursday of the following week. It is improbable that he journeyed on Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath, and especially that he took so long a journey as from Jericho to Bethany, which, according to the accounts of the other Evangelists, he must have done. The distance was twelve or fifteen miles. But if we put off his arrival at Bethany till Sunday, there will be, not six, but only five days between this and the supposed Passover on the following Friday. The hypothesis that the Passover was on Friday thus involves the improbable supposition that our Lord travelled to Bethany the preceding Saturday.

2 8. Remark the differences among the Evangelists.

2 “And a supper was made for him there.”

In the house of Simon the leper, as appears from Matthew (xxvi. 6) and Mark (xiv. 3).

3. Note the coincidence between John and Mark, which is especially remarkable, as the word *πιστικός* in the sense intended (whatever that may have been) is peculiar to the Evangelists.

5. Note the elliptical construction common to the three Evangelists.

6. “This he said because he was a thief, and had the money-box.”

I can find no satisfactory authority for giving to *γλωσσόκομον*

the sense of 'purse' or 'bag.' It was originally used to denote the box in which players on wind instruments preserved the mouth-pieces of those instruments. At least this is so stated by Hesychius. It was subsequently in common use, as denoting different kinds of boxes, or similar repositories, and particularly a box for containing money.

7. "Then Jesus said, Let her alone."

Our Lord, according to John, addressed Judas only; the verb in the original being in the singular number.

8. The reference of γάρ being to what is implied, not expressed, it is not to be rendered, as "for" in English requires a more obvious reference.

10, 11. "And the chief priests purposed the death of Lazarus also; because many of the Jews, on his account, drew off from them, and believed in Jesus."

The fact here stated may serve to explain why the raising of Lazarus was not mentioned by the earlier Evangelists.

20. "And there were some Greeks of the number of those who had come up to worship at the festival."

By Greeks "who had come up to worship at the festival" can be meant, I believe, no other than Greek (or Gentile) proselytes. Thus in the Acts (xvii. 4) we find mention of "worshipping Greeks," that is, of Greeks who had become proselytes to the Jewish religion. So also the Greeks men-

tioned in Acts xiv. 1 as present in a Jewish synagogue were, as it is reasonable to suppose, proselytes. And in a former passage in John's Gospel (vii. 35) the name Greek is probably applied to proselytes from the Greeks. See the note on that passage.

21. "Sir, we wish to see Jesus."

"— to see Jesus": — meaning, to have an interview with him.

23. "The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified."

The following discourse refers to the expectations entertained by the disciples of Jesus, and by the multitude in general, that he was about to assume regal dignity as the Messiah. (See verse 13.) They were desirous, we may suppose, of sharing the honors and rewards which the new king would dispense. Our Saviour tells them that he *was* about to be glorified, but through his death; that his servants must be ready to follow his example, and sacrifice their lives in his cause; and that those who were thus truly his servants would be rewarded by God. See Kuinoel's note. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

25. "He who hates his life in this world will preserve it for eternal blessedness."

The Common Version renders, "shall keep it unto life eternal." But by the words *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, verbally "eternal life," the idea of eternal blessedness is always expressed by our Lord and the writers of the New Testament. This idea is often implied with sufficient clearness in the verbal rendering

but there are cases like the present, where the sense is better brought out by giving directly the true import of the term.

28. "Father ! glorify thy name. Then there was a voice from heaven, *I have glorified it, and will glorify it again.*"

"Glorify thy name." Spread thy religion, and thus manifest thy glory, through my sufferings. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

"Then there was a voice from heaven." A question arises, whether this answer from heaven was an articulate voice, or whether it was given by a roll of thunder significant of God's approval of what Jesus had done and of the sacrifice which he had proffered. Nothing can be inferred merely from the use of the word *φωνή*, rendered "voice"; as that word is used of inarticulate as well as of articulate sounds, as, for example, of the sound of a trumpet, or of thunder.

The reason for entertaining this doubt is, that, according to the Evangelist, the multitude, that is, the multitude *generally*, did not hear the words which he gives, but only the sound of thunder. "The multitude said it thundered." "But others," he adds, "said, 'An angel has spoken to him.'" This they might have said, though they had heard no words. To the direct address of Jesus an immediate answer had been given by the sound of thunder from heaven, and it was a natural conception for a Jew, to suppose that it was given through the ministry of an angel. The supposition of so unequivocal and overwhelming a miracle as that of an articulate voice from heaven is inconsistent with the tone of feeling which the multitude, that is, some of their number, expressed immediately afterward, and with their question, "Who is this Son of Man?" (See verse 34.)

The signification of the answer given by this miraculous sign was obvious. It was an approval of what Jesus had done, and of the disposition which he manifested, as the minister through whom God had been and was to be glorified; and this signification, as we may suppose, John has expressed in words. [Compare the note on John xiii. 29.]

It is true that a modern writer, practised in composition, would not thus narrate, like the Evangelists, without fuller explanation. But the Evangelists were the unformed writers of a nation without literature, who expressed themselves very briefly and imperfectly, as men having no mastery over language, and finding its proper use difficult. They have often left much unexplained. This was the result of their deficiency in literary culture. But, at the same time, they probably felt that what was defective in their writings had been, or might be, supplied by oral communication.

31. “Now is judgment passing upon the world. Now will the ruler of this world be cast out.”

The principles which have ruled the world are condemned. Good shall triumph over evil. The hour of my death is the hour of my victory. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

Compare the note on ch. xvi. 8 – 11.

32. See Appendix, Note E, p. 522.

34. “We have heard out of the Law that the Messiah is to remain for ever. How, then, do you say that the Son of Man must be raised up? Who is this Son of Man?”

The common notion of the Jews appears to have been, that

the kingdom of the Messiah was to continue a thousand years before the dissolution of the world. But this long period of time, ending with the consummation of all earthly things, they, according to their customary modes of expression, denoted by the term which we render "for ever."

"How, then, do you say that the Son of Man must be raised up?" Jesus, according to the report of the Evangelist, had not applied to himself the designation "Son of Man" in his preceding words; but those who addressed him were doubtless well aware that he was accustomed to do so.

"— must be raised up":— Jesus had spoken of being "raised up from the earth": I suppose that those who addressed him had no more definite idea connected with the words, than that he was to be removed from earth.

As I have remarked, the tone of the question, "Who is this Son of Man?" is evidently disrespectful. Jesus does not directly answer it; but addresses himself to the state of feeling indicated by it in the calm and solemn admonition which follows. In this admonition he, at the same time, gives an indirect answer to it, by presenting to view the high office and authority which he claimed as the light of the world.

37-41. (The incredulity of the Jews.)

One main purpose of John's Gospel being, as I suppose, to explain the circumstances under which Jesus was rejected by the Jews, it will be perceived how appropriately the thoughts in these verses are introduced in the conclusion of an account of his public ministry to them. It is the purpose of the Evangelist to say that the incredulity of his countrymen formed no objection to the authority of his Master, as it had been foreseen and predicted. It was but the counterpart of that with which

the prophet Isaiah, as well as the other prophets of God, had been received by the Jews.

Notice that John, in the 37th verse, appeals *only* to the miracles of Christ as evidence of his divine mission.

38. “And thus what was said by Isaiah the prophet was fulfilled.”

It is evident that St. John considered the passages which he quotes from Isaiah as prophetic of the times of Christ. This is placed beyond doubt by his assertion (verse 41), “Thus said Isaiah when he saw his glory, and spoke of him.”

But it is equally evident that, in their proper and primary sense, as determined by their original connection, they relate to the times of the prophet. St. John, therefore, must have supposed, conformably to the notions prevalent among the Jews of his time concerning the interpretation of the Old Testament, that the words had a secondary, mystical sense, in which they were prophetic of the times of Christ.

39. “Hence they could not have faith.”

The word rendered “have faith” is the same which in the preceding verse is rendered by “believe”: “LORD! who believed what they heard from us?” that is, Who assented to the truth of what they heard from us? But this word throughout the New Testament has a more pregnant and higher sense when used in reference to Jesus. To believe *in* him is to put faith in him, to become his follower, his true follower. The meaning of the Evangelist, therefore, is, that they did not credit what he said, and *hence* they could not become his followers.

40. “ *He has blinded their eyes, and made their minds callous, so that they see not with their eyes, nor understand with their minds, nor turn from their ways, for me to heal them.*”

In this quotation the Evangelist has varied much from his original (Isaiah vi. 9, 10), especially in giving the words a narrative, not an imperative form.

In the Hebrew original Isaiah represents God as saying to him, “Go, make the mind of this people callous, make their ears deaf, and blind their eyes.” In poetical or rhetorical language, expressive of strong indignation, the result of the prophet’s preaching, supposed to be foreseen, is described as its purpose. The meaning is, “Go, warn and exhort; but the result of your warnings and exhortations will be to harden this people in their perversity: go and do this.” Isaiah having represented himself as commanded to do this, St. John, in applying the words in a mystical sense to our Lord, represents it as having been done by him. The result of his preaching in regard to the great body of the Jews had been to harden their hearts.

41. “Thus said Isaiah when he saw his glory.”

“When he saw his glory” means, When he *foresaw* it, as, before (ch. viii. 56), Jesus says, “Abraham saw,” that is, foresaw, “my day.” “His glory” is the glory of Jesus, of which John speaks in the first chapter of his Gospel (verse 14): “We beheld his glory, such as an only son receives from a father.” See also ch. ii. 11; xi. 4, 40, and verse 37 of this chapter.

See, further, Statement of Reasons, pp. 225, 226.

44. “But Jesus had proclaimed,” &c.

The aorist ἐκράξεν is here used as in many similar cases ; the meaning being best expressed in English by rendering it as if it were a pluperfect.

47. In the beginning of this verse I do not render καί, because the English particle “and” would imply a relationship between the words following it and the preceding which does not exist.

XIII. 1. “But Jesus, before the feast of the Passover, knew that the hour had come for him to pass from this world to the Father,” &c.

The words with which this passage commences refer, as I conceive, to our Lord’s foreknowledge of his approaching death at the Passover. Before the Passover he knew that his hour had come, and having loved his own, he continued to manifest his love to them to the last. The Evangelist had in mind those striking proofs of the love of Jesus for his disciples which he was about to record. That the words “before the feast of the Passover” relate to the foreknowledge of our Lord, appears not merely from the obvious and apposite meaning which results from understanding them as having this relation, but also from the manner in which his knowledge — and particularly his knowledge of his approaching death, that he was “going to the Father” — is immediately after referred to (in the third verse), by way of introduction to a proof of his love for his disciples.

It is a very forced interpretation, to regard the words “before the feast of the Passover” as intended to fix the date of what follows. They determine no *particular* time ; and as a general reference to some time before the Passover that imme-

diately preceded our Lord's death, they are wholly idle. In this view they would be merely equivalent to the words "before his death."

Supposing the night to which the succeeding narrative relates not to be the night of the Passover, St. John has in the second verse abruptly introduced the mention of a supper in a manner in which it cannot readily be believed that any writer would. But if it were a well-known fact, that our Lord held a solemn meeting and discourse with his disciples on the night of the paschal supper, then the words "before the feast of the Passover," with those which follow, would be a sufficient introduction to the mention of a supper.

2-17. (The washing of the feet of his disciples by Jesus.)

We find an account in Luke (ch. xxii. 24-30) relating to what took place at the last supper of our Lord with his Apostles, which is connected with the narrative given by John of his washing the feet of his disciples. According to the report of Luke, his words were intended to produce the same state of feeling in his Apostles as it was his purpose to inculcate by that symbolical act, and by his words as recorded by John. But the words given by Luke are such as we find before in his own Gospel, and in those of Matthew and Mark; and Luke was not present at the occasion. From these circumstances, and from the fact that they are not mentioned by John, though he would be naturally led to introduce them in relation to the subject of the narrative before us, we may reasonably doubt whether the words given by Luke were spoken by Jesus at this time, or whether Luke only understood, generally, that the purpose of Jesus in what he said was to destroy all worldly

pride and rivalry in the minds of his Apostles, and expressed this purpose in words which he knew our Lord had used with this intent.

Referring to a fact apparent from the preceding history, Luke begins his narrative by saying, "And there existed a rivalry among them as to which of them was the greatest." This rivalry related to worldly distinctions and honors. Their false estimate of these, their erroneous hopes and expectations concerning them, and the selfish and jealous feelings which were thus produced, it had been a main purpose of our Lord during his ministry to correct. It was to this end, for example, that he addressed them in the discourse recorded in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, when he placed a child before them and said, "I tell you in truth, Unless you are changed and become as children, you will not enter the kingdom of Heaven." Nothing could have conduced more effectually to this purpose, than the lesson which, according to John, he gave to his disciples, — a lesson which would be most deeply impressed on their minds, not only by its very remarkable character, but by all those solemn and thrilling memories that would gather round the occasion on which it was given. They had been jealous of each other about worldly pre-eminence ; about the honors which they should respectively attain in that kingdom of the Messiah for which they hoped. To correct this state of mind, their Master — to whom they looked up with undefined reverence, any familiarity with whom had seemed a trespass, on whose coming grandeur all their hopes were founded — took on himself the garb and office of a slave, and washed their feet. They must have been utterly astonished.

What he had done, he proceeds to say, was done for an example to them. The lesson which he thus taught them was,

that they — the followers of a Master who had washed their feet, and who was just about to suffer the most cruel ignominy — were to put wholly out of view all the objects of vanity and ambition ; that they were to consider nothing as degrading which was not degrading in the sight of God ; and, especially, that they should be bound together by such strong love, and with such a feeling of equality, that they should look on no service which they could perform for another as humiliating. — As I have remarked in speaking of the Lord's Supper, it was not the particular action performed which Jesus meant to prescribe, it was the state of mind which would be indicated by the performance of such an action. The act itself was symbolical. (See the note on Luke xxii. 19.)

At the present day, neither the followers of Christ in general, nor any particular portion of their number, stand in the same relations to one another as did the Apostles, or are placed in the same circumstances in which they were, or have the same duties to perform. We are not required to disregard the common distinctions of life, or the observances which belong to different stations. The lesson to be derived by us from the act and the precepts of our Lord on this occasion — and it is a most important lesson — is, that we are to view those distinctions and observances as constituting no essential difference between men ; that we are to esteem nothing as degrading which it is our duty to perform or suffer ; and that we are to have that love for our fellow-men which, in the words of one of our old poets, “ holds no office mean ” by which they may be benefited.

8. “ If I wash you not, you have no part with me.”

That is, you keep yourself aloof from the rest of my disciples

whose feet I am washing ; you except yourself from their number ; you do not consent to the will of your Master, but set yourself up to judge of the propriety of his actions ; you do not receive, in the spirit in which an Apostle of mine must receive it, the most important lesson which I am giving ; you refuse to submit to what I propose to do, from a feeling that the service is in itself degrading, — a feeling which my disciples must not entertain.

So the words of Jesus may be analyzed and explained. But they are not to be regarded as a weighty rebuke or grave expostulation. Peter, it is probable, but very partially understood the reasons which might be given for his Master's declaration, but its obvious, unexplained sense was abundantly sufficient to affect his mind.

10. “He who has bathed needs only to wash his feet, to be altogether clean. — And you are clean, but not all.”

The feet of the ancients were so imperfectly protected, that they required frequent washing. But if a person had bathed during the course of the day, this washing might be all that was needed to make him altogether clean. The words of Jesus are merely an obvious and quiet reply to Peter's address. •

But Jesus knew himself to be on the eve of a terrible death ; and from the state of mind which his familiar answer might seem to imply, and from the feelings produced by the ardent devotion of Peter, his thoughts immediately turned to the fact, that amid the company around him was the treacherous follower through whose agency his sufferings were to be brought upon him. Borrowing a figure, therefore, as he often did, from what he had last spoken of, he subjoins, “And you are clean, but not all.”

It may be remarked, that on a former occasion (see ch. vi. 68–70) the strong expression of attachment on the part of Peter at once directed his thoughts to the character of Judas : “Have I not chosen you Twelve for myself? and one of you speaks evil of me.”

17. “Happy will it be for you, if, understanding what I have done and said, you act accordingly.”

“— understanding what I have done and said” : — verbally, “if you know” (or understand) “these things.”

18. “But this choice I made, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, *He who ate of the same loaf with me has plotted my overthrow.*”

Respecting the ellipsis in this verse, see the note on John ix. 3.

“— that the Scripture might be fulfilled.” See the note on Matthew iv. 14.

Note the great variation from the Septuagint in the quotation.

23. “But one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved, was lying at the breast of Jesus.”

That is, John, who here speaks of himself (see ch. xix. 26 ; xx. 2 ; xxi. 7, 20, 24), was placed at table next to Jesus, in the reclining posture which the ancients adopted, so that his head was nearly opposite to the breast of his Master.

24. “Then Simon Peter made a sign to this dis-

ciple, and said to him, Tell who it is of whom he speaks.”

The true reading here is uncertain. I follow that which, on the whole, appears to me most probable. If it be correct, we may suppose Peter to have thought that John, from his familiarity with our Lord, might be acquainted with the secret, or that he might obtain knowledge of the individual meant, and leave to communicate it.

26. “Jesus answered, It is he to whom I shall give this piece when I have dipped it. And, after he had dipped it, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.”

“It is he to whom I shall give this piece,” — that is, as appears probable from what follows, a portion of meat, — “when I have dipped it,” namely, in the vessel of sauce which stood on the table, in which meat rather than bread would be dipped. The ancients, not having forks for the table, used their hands alone in taking solid food, and offered it in their hands to others.

The giving of this piece to Judas was, I conceive, a strong indirect expression, on the part of Jesus, of his deep feeling of the treachery of one who had been so intimately connected with him, and who was about to break those ties which the ancients considered as so sacred, contracted by eating of the same food, at the same table. (See the note on Matthew xxvi. 26–28.) The answer of Jesus was, in effect, “I am about to share the food before me with my betrayer.” The feeling indicated by this act was the same which he had before expressed in words: “He who ate of the same loaf with me has plotted my

overthrow"; He who puts his hand into the same dish with me will betray me.

29. Observe the use of λέγει αὐτῷ to denote what was supposed to be said not expressly, but by implication. Compare the note on ch. xii. 28.

31, 32. "When he had gone out, Jesus said, Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified with him. And as God is glorified with him, so God will glorify him with himself, and will immediately glorify him."

The words translated "And as God is glorified with him" are omitted in some ancient manuscripts and other authorities; but, as I suppose, through an accident occasioned by the like ending of this clause with that which immediately precedes it. — For the rendering of ἐν, not by "in," but by "with," see the note on ch. iii. 21. The meaning is, God is glorified together with him on earth, and will glorify him together with himself in heaven.

These minute criticisms must not be suffered to divert our attention from the marvellous sublimity of the words of Jesus. His betrayer, as he knew, had gone out to concert with his enemies the means by which they might seize upon him that very night. There was present to his view the mental and bodily agony, the dreadful insults, and the excruciating suffering which he was in a few hours to endure. But, suppressing all personal feelings of anguish and dismay, he regards what lay before him merely as the necessary consummation of his glorious ministry of mercy to men, by which God, in his true character, was to

be made known. What conceptions too exalted can we form of him who immediately after the departure of Judas uttered the words, "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified with him"? And when we comprehend and sympathize with the circumstances of him by whom they were spoken, do they not alone afford the strongest evidence of his divine mission, and of the truth of what he proceeds to assert? — "God will glorify him with himself, and will immediately glorify him."

34. "A new commandment I give you, that you love one another, — that you love one another as I have loved you."

"A new commandment": — that is, one not found in the Decalogue, and one which had not been understood and acted upon to the extent and in the spirit in which it was inculcated by Jesus.

XIV. 3. "Were it not so, should I have told you that I am going there to prepare a place for you?"

So, I believe, these words should be constructed. The pointing which separates the words, "Were it not so, I should have told you," by a period, from those which follow, is modern, being introduced by Laurentius Valla, as is supposed, in the fifteenth century.* By the ancient interpreters, these words were connected with those which follow them, — a connection which is indicated in some of the most important ancient manuscripts and versions by the insertion of *ὅτι*, "that," be-

* See Knappii Scripta Varii Argumenti, p. 282.

fore πορεύομαι, "I am going"; if indeed ὅτι were not the original reading. — I render, "I am going *there*," merely to avoid the ambiguity which would arise from saying, "I am going to prepare," which might be taken as meaning, "I am about to prepare."

On the figurative language of this passage see Appendix, Note E, pp. 522, 523.

6. "I am the Way, and the Truth, and Eternal Life."

"The Truth": — see the note on ch. viii. 32. "Eternal Life": — see the note on ch. xi. 25.

8. "Philip said to him, Master, show us the Father, and we shall be satisfied."

The meaning of Philip I conceive to have been this: You speak of our having seen God. I do not understand this. Show us the Father, and we shall be satisfied. Philip undoubtedly had in mind the accounts of the apparitions of God in the Jewish Scriptures.

11. Compare ch. x. 37, 38.

12. "He who believes in me shall himself do the works which I do; and greater works than these shall he do."

This proposition, though expressed in general terms, is evidently to be limited to the Apostles to whom it was addressed. It is equivalent to the words, "If you believe in me, you shall do the works which I do, and greater works than these shall

you do.” For an explanation of these words, see the note on ch. v. 20.

13. “Whatever you may ask, as my disciples, I will do.”

Verbally, “Whatever you may ask in my name.” To ask in the name of another means, in its primary and proper signification, to ask for another, as his representative or servant, to ask in his cause. Jesus, in saying “I will do” what you may ask, figuratively ascribes to himself that power which God would exert in his cause ; — conformably to a mode of speaking before explained. (See the note on Matthew xiii. 36 – 43.) The promise, it is to be observed, relates to what they should ask in his cause, as his disciples ; and is equivalent to the words, God will grant you all you need as my ministers.

16, 17. “I will ask the Father, and he will give you another teacher who will abide with you always, — the spirit of the Truth, which the world cannot receive, for it does not discern it, nor know it ; but you know it, for it abides with you, and it shall be in you.”

“I will ask the Father.” The language is figurative. The meaning is, It will be as if I, your Master and friend, who stand in so intimate and peculiar a relation to God, who in the cause in which I am engaged am one with God, were to ask of him this blessing for the furtherance of those purposes of mercy toward men, of which he has made me his minister.

“— and he will give you another teacher.” I agree with Kuinoel in thinking that the word here used in the original,

παράκλητος, “paraclete,” figuratively denotes one who, like our Saviour, should not merely instruct, but guide and assist the disciples; but in rendering the term we must take a name which is equally applicable to “the Spirit” considered as personified, and to Jesus himself, whose place that Spirit is represented as coming to supply. The office of “the Spirit” is afterward particularly described (vv. 25, 26, and ch. xvi. 8–14) as that of a teacher.

“The spirit of the Truth”:—not “the Spirit of truth,” according to the common rendering, in which the force of the article is neglected, and which presents no clear meaning, but “the spirit of *the* Truth,” that is, as the last term, “the Truth,” has been before explained (see the note on ch. viii. 32), the spirit of Christ’s religion, of true religion, here considered as existing in the mind through God’s influences.

This spirit, the world—worldly and sinful men—could not receive, because they did not discern nor understand it; “but you know it,” Jesus says to his disciples, “for it abides with you” as my disciples, you have already in some degree known and felt it; “and it shall be in you.”

18, 19. “I will not leave you fatherless. I am coming to you again,” &c.

See Appendix, Note E, p. 522.

22–24. (The question of Judas, the brother of James, and our Saviour’s reply.)

The Apostles had been looking forward to the time when Jesus would manifest himself to the Jewish nation as the Messiah, according to those conceptions of the Messiah which they

entertained in common with their countrymen. It was with this idea in his mind that Judas asked, "Master, and how is it that you will manifest yourself to us, and not to the world?" In reply, Jesus repeats in effect, and adds to, the expressions which he had before used, so as to indicate that it was not a visible, but a spiritual, manifestation of his presence of which he spoke. This manifestation would be made to those who obeyed his words; and, in reference to the question of Judas, how it could be that he would manifest himself to some and not to all, he brings into view the fact, that many would not obey his words. "He who loves me not obeys not my words."

27. "My peace I give you. Not as the world gives peace, do I give peace to you."

"Peace be with you" was a common form of leave-taking, as well as of salutation, among the Jews and other Orientals. The meaning of our Lord is, that, in giving peace to his disciples, in this his farewell discourse, his words were not as those uttered in the world, a mere form, but an earnest benediction, and a promise of peace.

31. "Arise, let us go hence."

That is, Rise from table, and let us prepare to go hence. It is not to be imagined that Jesus would have concluded this most solemn and affecting discourse, delivered on an occasion so momentous to his Apostles and to the whole world, without prayer. It was its only natural termination. He rose from table to pray. But it may seem that, before rising, his discourse had been interrupted by the thoughts that rushed in upon him of his own approaching sufferings, of what he was to endure from the spirit that ruled the world.

After rising from table, however, he resumed, or continued, his self-command, and when he had exhorted his disciples to remain faithful to him, he then, without adverting to his own sufferings, announced to them those to which they would be exposed, and bent his mind to afford them all the support and encouragement which, as the minister of God, he was qualified to give.

A practised writer of the present day would, undoubtedly, between the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth chapter, have inserted some such words as these: "And after rising from table, he thus continued his discourse." But this is a sort of explanation which we must have read the Evangelists very carelessly to expect from one of them, for they are among the most imperfect of writers. And perhaps it was least of all to be expected here from St. John, carried away by his feelings as he must have been, in recording these words of his Master.

XV. 11. "I have said these things to you, that my joy may be felt by you, and your joy made perfect."

In justification of the rendering which I have given, compare ch. xvii. 2, 13, 22, 26.

22. "If I had not come and taught them, they would not be thus guilty."

"— they would not be thus guilty," *ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον*. This is an example of the Oriental idiom which expresses comparative inferiority by a direct negation. Compare ch. ix. 41

XVI. 2. "He who kills you will think that he is offering a sacrifice to God."

See Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, p. 271.

4. "But I have thus spoken to you, that, when the hour has come, you may remember that I said these things to you. I have not said them to you heretofore, because I have been with you."

"I have thus spoken to you." Jesus refers to all that he had before said; as he does in the first verse and in the sixth, and also before, ch. xiv. 25, xv. 11, and afterward, verses 25 and 33. He does not refer particularly to his prediction of the sufferings of the Apostles which immediately precedes.

7. "But I tell you the truth, it is better for you that I should go; for if I do not go, the Teacher will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you."

While our Lord remained with his disciples in the exercise of his public ministry, their expectations would still cling to those earthly conceptions of his office which they held in common with their countrymen. They would not comprehend the character of his religion nor be penetrated by its spirit. But by the terrible circumstances of his death, and by his removal from them, their Jewish prejudices would be prostrated; and their minds would be opened to the comprehension, that the religion of which they had been appointed ministers in his place was essentially connected in all its relations with the spiritual world,

with God and eternity, dealing in no offers of temporal aggrandizement, and presenting no security from earthly sufferings.

The lesson was, as it could not but be, effectual. The sufferings and death of Jesus were a legacy of immeasurable value, not merely for their instruction and to fit them for their office. They are a legacy of incalculable value to all his followers in all time. They teach us the character and power of his religion as these could have been taught us in no other manner.

8-11. (The consequences of the coming of “the Teacher,” or “the spirit of the Truth.”)

This passage presents what we may believe to be the meaning of our Lord with such a want of fulness and distinctness, that we may reasonably conjecture that his words are imperfectly reported by the Evangelist.

The meaning intended by our Lord, may, I suppose, be thus explained. “The Teacher,” as I have before said, is the spirit of his religion personified. (See the note on ch. xiv. 16, 17.) By the term, the spirit of his religion, or, the spirit of the Truth, I would express the whole character and effect of the truths which he taught, considered as operating on the hearts and minds of men in connection with direct influences from God. This future manifestation of the character and power of his religion would evince the sinfulness of the unbelieving world,—that sinfulness, that general corruption, which, existing in the world, nothing but faith in him could remove; and the effect of which was shown in the rejection of his authority. It would bring conviction of this fact; that is, it would afford evidence of it, which in its own nature would be decisive and convincing. It would, at the same time, make manifest the righteousness of those who received the truths which he taught, and felt their

power. Though followers of a Master who had been put to a death of torture as a blasphemer, it would appear that they were acceptable to God. For he, the divinely commissioned teacher of these truths, was going to God to remain with him for ever. In opposition to the false notions which the majority of his countrymen entertained of him and his doctrine and his followers, the prevalence of the spirit of his religion would make evident what was sin and what was righteousness; who were the sinners and who the righteous. And in proportion as men's minds should be enlightened and their hearts improved by his religion, they would clearly discern that a sentence of condemnation had been passed on the spirit of the world,—personified as “the ruler of the world”; or, in other words, that the temper, the purposes, the dispositions, and the principles by which the generality of men had heretofore been governed, were condemned by God.

Thus it appears that Jesus was speaking of the results which would be produced after his personal ministry should be concluded, when “the spirit of the Truth,” the spirit of his religion, should be left, as it were, alone in the world, to operate without his visible aid.

13-15. “When he, the spirit of the Truth, comes, he will be your guide to the whole Truth,” &c.

The obscurity of this passage, like that on which we have last remarked, may arise in part from the imperfect report of the Evangelist. But it is essentially produced by modes of conception and expression with which we are not familiar, and to which we cannot readily accommodate our minds.

“The spirit of the Truth,” the spirit of Christ’s religion, as I have already explained those terms, consists in the knowledge and belief of the essential truths taught by him, and in corresponding affections. But this state of mind is produced by the Spirit of God ; that is, by direct or indirect influences upon the mind, proceeding from God.

Thus “the spirit of the Truth,” and “the Spirit of God,” by which it is produced, become interchangeable terms. The former is the effect of the latter acting upon the mind. The spirit of Christianity, viewed in reference to the cause which produces it, and coexists with it, is the Spirit of God.

It is under this double aspect, that the spirit spoken of by Jesus is to be regarded throughout his discourse. His language is conformed sometimes more to one view of it, and sometimes more to the other. In the passage before us, it is to be regarded as the Spirit of God directly illuminating the minds of the Apostles, and aiding them in their labors.

It is further to be observed, that this spirit is personified by our Lord as the Teacher who was coming to supply his place. His language concerning it is, of course, conformed to this personification. It is throughout figurative, and consequently does not admit of being taken in a literal sense. The meaning of it in the passage before us may be explained as follows.

“He will not speak from himself, but will speak what he hears.” Our Lord had before said of his own teaching, “I speak not from myself.” “The words which you hear are not mine, but the Father’s who sent me.” He now describes in the same manner the Teacher whom the Apostles were to have in his place. The meaning of his words is, that there would be no error in the instructions and guidance of that Teacher, such as might be apprehended from a merely human

teacher speaking from himself. God, through the influences of his Spirit, would himself enlighten, strengthen, and direct them.

“He will explain* to you the events which are coming.” That is, he will explain to you the true character and purpose of my sufferings and death, the first effect of which upon you will be so appalling; and he will explain to you all those circumstances, so strange and so unexpected by you, which will befall you as teachers of my religion.

“He will take what is mine, and communicate it to you.” By him your minds will be opened to comprehend the truths which I have taught, — to comprehend *my* religion. And the Spirit of God will communicate to you that power from him which it is his will to exert for *my* cause. Omnipotence is on my side. “Whatever the Father has is mine.”

My cause is the cause of God. The power of God will be displayed in making known through you the truths which I have taught. Hence, though all the light and aid which you will require will be from God alone, I spoke of the Teacher as taking what is mine, and communicating it to you.

23. “And then you will have no need to question me.”

“The words ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, rendered [in the Common Version] ‘in that day,’ are merely equivalent to the adverb ‘then.’ The time intended is that following our Saviour’s ascension, when, in figurative language, he says that he shall be with his Apostles again, not referring to his personal presence, but to his presence with them in the power and blessings of his gospel, and in the aid afforded them by God as his ministers” — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 158, 159, note †.

XVII. 3. "And this is eternal life, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

Note the use of "Jesus Christ" as a proper name, a mode of expression belonging to the Evangelist, not to our Lord.

5. "And now, Father! glorify me with thyself, giving me that glory which I had with thee before the world was."

"One of the main objections of the generality of the Jews to Christianity was its being a novelty, an innovation, subverting their former faith. The Pharisees said, 'We are disciples of Moses. We know that God spoke to Moses; but as for this man, we know not whence he is.' (John ix. 28, 29.) The doctrine of Christ was in direct opposition to the popular religion of the Jews, which, though a religion of hypocrisy, formalities, superstition, and bigotry, they had identified in their own minds with the Law; — and the Law, their ancient Law, which for fifteen centuries, as they believed, had been their distinguishing glory, they looked upon as an immutable covenant made by God with his chosen people. Were the doctrines of Christ, they might ask, to be opposed to what they believed, and what their fathers had believed, upon the faith of God? Was a teacher of yesterday to be placed in competition with Moses and the Prophets? Was it to be supposed that God would change his purposes, alter the terms of their allegiance, and substitute a new religion for that which he had so solemnly sanctioned?"

"One mode of meeting these feelings and prejudices of the Jews was by the use of language adapted to their modes of con-

ception, asserting or implying that the sending of Christ, and the establishment of his religion, had always been purposed by God. This was done in part by figurative modes of speech, conformed to the Oriental style, and more or less similar to many which we find in the Old Testament. Facts connected with the introduction of Christianity were spoken of by Christ and his Apostles — according to the verbal meaning of their language — as having taken place before the world was; the purpose being to express in the most forcible manner, that their existence was to be referred immediately to God, and had from eternity been predetermined by him. What they meant to represent God as having foreordained, they described as actually existing.

“ Thus St. Paul says in his Epistle to the Romans (viii. 29 30), ‘ For those whom God foreknew, he predestined should be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren; and whom he predestined he summoned, and whom he summoned he made righteous, and whom he made righteous he glorified.’ I refer particularly to the last clause, in which God is spoken of as having already glorified the disciples of Christ, because it is certain that he will.*

“ Thus also in writing to the Ephesians (i. 3, 4) : ‘ Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, having exalted us to heaven, is blessing us with every spiritual blessing through Christ, he *having in his love chosen us through him before the foundation of the world.*’

“ To Timothy (2 Ep. i. 8, 9) he says : ‘ Suffer together with me for the gospel, sustained by the power of God, who has delivered us, and summoned us by a sacred call, not in conse-

“ * Compare verses 17 – 25.”

quence of our works, but conformably to his own purpose, and *the favor bestowed upon us through Christ Jesus before time was.*'

"So also to Titus (i. 1, 2): 'Paul, a servant of God, and an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to preach the faith of the chosen of God, and to make known the truth which leads to the true worship of God, founded on the expectation of eternal life, which God, who cannot deceive, *promised before time was.*'"

For other passages in which that which is purposed by God is figuratively spoken of as actually existing, see Exodus xv. 13, comp. 17; 1 Samuel xv. 28; Psalm cxxxix. 16; Isaiah xlix. 1; John x. 16; Acts xviii. 10; Galatians i. 15.

"When Christianity, after having been preached to the Jews, was, if I may so speak, committed in trust to its Gentile converts, it had to encounter the same objection of its being a novel doctrine; and this objection was met in a similar manner, and by a similar use of language. In his 'Exhortation to the Gentiles,' Clement of Alexandria says: 'Error is ancient, truth appears a novelty.' Then, after mentioning some of those nations which made the most extravagant pretensions to antiquity, he adds: 'But we [Christians] were before the foundation of the world; through the certainty of our future existence, previously existing in God himself.' *

"* *Πρὸ δὲ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου καταβολῆς ἡμεῖς · οἱ τῷ δεῖν ἔσεσθαι, ἐν αὐτῷ πρότερον γεγεννημένοι τῷ Θεῷ*, p. 6, ed. Potter." — Thus too in a book which in very early times was in considerable repute among Christians, 'The Shepherd of Hermas,' Hermas represents himself as being told by an angel in a vision, that 'the Church was the first created of all things, and for her sake the world was made.' (Lib. I. Vis. 2.)

"We find the same figurative use of language in the writings of

“ We should hardly expect to find in the New Testament a critical explanation of any figurative mode of speech ; but something very like such an explanation of that which we are considering is found in St. Paul, when his words are properly translated and understood.”

In the book of Genesis (xvii. 4, 5) God is represented as saying to Abraham, “ Behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham ; for *a father of many nations have I made thee.*” Referring to

the later Jews. In the Talmud it is recorded that R. Eliezer said : ‘ Seven things were created before the world ; the Garden of Eden, the Law, the Righteous, the Israelites, the Throne of Glory, Jerusalem, and the Messiah, the Son of David.’ This, in the Book Cosri, is explained as meaning, that ‘ they were prior in the intention of God ’ ; they constituting the end for which the world was created ; and the end being *in intention* precedent to the means. (Liber Cosri, ed. Buxtorf. p. 254.)” Many similar passages are quoted or referred to by Schoettgen (Horæ Hebr., Tom. II. pp. 436, 437), among which are the following. Sohar Levit., fol. 14, col. 56 : “ Rabbi Hezekiah sat down in the presence of Eleazar and asked, How many lights were created before the foundation of the world ? He answered, Seven ; the light of the Law, the light of Gehenna, the light of Paradise, the light of the Throne of Glory, the light of the Temple, the light of Repentance, and the light of the Messiah.” In various other Rabbinical books cited by Schoettgen we find the same enumeration, except that the word “ light ” is omitted throughout, and “ the *name* of the Messiah ” is substituted for “ the light of the Messiah.” But in Bereshith Rabba, sect. 1, fol. 3, 3, there is a different statement : — “ Six things preceded the creation of the world : some of these were created, as the Law and the Throne of Glory ; others it was in the

this passage, St. Paul says, “in his Epistle to the Romans (iv. 16, 17): ‘The promise was sure to all the offspring of Abraham, not to those under the Law only, but to those who have the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all (as it is written, *I have made thee a father of many nations*) in the sight of God in whom he trusted, — of Him who restores life to the dead, and speaks of the things which are not, as though they were.’ In the view of the Apostle, God, as it were, restored life to the dead, in enabling Abraham and Sarah to have a son; * and, in

mind of God to create, namely, the Patriarchs, Israel, the Temple, and the name of the Messiah.” In Midrash Tehillim, fol. 28, 2, it is said that the use of the word קָדַם in Psalm lxxiv. 2 “teaches us, that God created Israel before the foundation of the world.” The same commentary elsewhere says, that “Repentance preceded the creation of the world”; and in Sohar Levit., fol. 29, col. 113, the following passage occurs: “Before God created the world, he created Repentance, and said to her, It is my will to create man in such a relation to thee, that, when he returns to thee from his transgressions, thou shalt be ready to forgive his transgressions, and to make expiation for them.”

“* That this was the meaning of the Apostle appears from the verses which immediately follow those quoted above: ‘For he [Abraham] had confident hope of that which was past hope, that he should be the father of many nations, according to the declaration, *Thus will thy offspring be*. And, not being weak in faith, he did not regard his own body then dead, he being about a hundred years old, nor the deadness of Sarah’s womb; nor had he any doubt or mistrust about the promise of God.’

“Compare also Hebrews xi. 19, where, in reference to the birth of Isaac, Abraham is said to have received him, ‘figuratively speaking, from the dead.’”

calling Abraham the father of many nations, spoke of the things which were not, as though they were.

“ Using language in the manner which has been illustrated, our Saviour spoke, in his last prayer with his disciples, on the night before his death, of the glory which he had with God before the world was.

.

“ Afterwards, in speaking of his disciples, our Saviour says, ‘ The glory which thou hast given me I have given them ’ (John xvii. 22) ; words implying that the glory which he had with the Father was such as might be conferred on men ; and such as, by constituting them his Apostles, he had enabled them to attain.

“ ‘ Father ! ’ he continues, ‘ I desire for those whom thou hast given me, that where I am they also may be with me, so that they may behold my glory, which thou gavest me, for thou didst love me before the foundation of the world. ’ (Verse 24.)

“ The character and purport of these expressions of Jesus are explained by what has been said. A principal object of our Saviour in the language of this prayer, as well as throughout the discourse which precedes it, was to strengthen the minds of his Apostles to meet that fearful trial of their faith which was close at hand, and to prepare them for their approaching separation from him. He uses, in consequence, the most forcible modes of speech in order to produce the deepest impression. He desired, by the whole weight of his authority, by every feeling of affection and awe, by language the most pregnant and of the highest import, and by figures too strong and solemn ever to be forgotten, to make them feel his connection, and their own connection, with God. Their teacher, their master, their friend, was the special messenger of God, distinguished by his favor

beyond all other men; and in this favor they shared, as his followers. He was, in the Oriental style, ‘one with God’ in the work in which he had been engaged; and they, in like manner, were to be one with God and him. God had from eternity regarded him with love; and they were like objects of God’s love.* They were hereafter to behold in heaven the consummate glory of him, who before the close of another day was to be exposed to the mockery of the Roman soldiers, to suffer the outrages of an infuriated mob, and to expire by a death as ignominious as it was cruel.” — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 169 – 175.

Compare the notes on ch. viii. 58 and vi. 61, 62.

11. “I am to remain no longer in the world, but these will remain in the world, while I am coming to thee. Holy Father! preserve them as thy ministers, in the ministry which thou hast given me, that they, as we, may be one.”

“Preserve them as thy ministers, in the ministry which thou hast given me.” *Τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ᾧ δέδωκας μοι*, verbally, “Preserve them in thy name, which thou hast given me.” To act in the name of another is to act as his minister, as his follower, by his instructions, by his authority. To be in the name of another accordingly means, to be his minister, his follower, invested with authority derived from him. “Preserve them in” or “with thy name,” that is, bearing thy name, “which thou hast given me.” Continue to them the authority

* ‘ — that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me.’ John xvii. 23.”

which I have received from thee. This interpretation corresponds with what follows. See vv. 18, 22.—*MS. Notes of Lectures.*

12. “While I was with them, I preserved them as thine. I guarded those whom thou hast given me; and no one of them is lost, but the child of perdition;—that the Scripture might be fulfilled.”

“I preserved them as thine”:—verbally, “I preserved them in” or “with thy name,” bearing thy name, as thy followers. The meaning is analogous to that of the corresponding language in the eleventh verse, though not precisely the same. The disciples of Christ were already consecrated to God, devoted to his service, though they were not yet invested with the authority which they had after the death of their Master.—*MS. Notes of Lectures.*

“—that the Scripture might be fulfilled.” “The meaning is, that the treachery of Judas was a means by which the purposes of God, as revealed in the Scriptures, were to be accomplished. The object of our Saviour was to impress the minds of his Apostles with the truth, that his approaching sufferings and death were not the result of any unexpected event, nor of the power of his enemies triumphing over him; but that they were necessary to the accomplishment of that great plan for the moral renovation of mankind, which had been partially unfolded in the Old Testament. They had been anticipated and voluntarily submitted to by himself. The crime of Judas was one link in the train of causes which led to that consummation.”—*On the Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* *Christian Examiner*, Vol. V. pp. 55, 56.

18. “As thou hast sent me to the world, so I send them to the world.”

Observe the use of the same language respecting the mission of Christ and that of his Apostles. — *MS. Notes of Lectures.*

24. “For thou didst love me before the foundation of the world.”

See the note on verse 5.

XVIII. 1. “Having thus spoken, Jesus went with his disciples to a garden beyond the Kedron.”

“— beyond the Kedron,” *πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τοῦ Κέδρων.* We have not expressed *τοῦ χειμάρρου* in the translation. Neither the word “brook” nor “torrent” would convey a correct idea to an English reader. So far as the Kedron is a flow of water it is a winter torrent, as the name here given it denotes, running only during the rainy season, and not always then. During the greater part of the year, and sometimes during the whole year, its channel is empty. It lies at the bottom of what has been called “the Valley of Jehoshaphat,” which separates Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives. See Robinson’s *Biblical Researches*, Vol. I. pp. 396–402.

3–13. (The circumstances of our Lord’s apprehension.)

Compare Matthew xxvi. 47–57; Mark xiv. 43–53; Luke xxii. 47–54.

The manner in which the Evangelists have related the apprehension of our Lord strikingly exhibits their character as writers. They relate but few particulars, and of these few all

are not told by any one of their number ; — and they give no explanations. They thought only of contemporary readers, not of readers of some distant age and country, who might not be readily aware of facts which were distinctly present to their own minds, and a consideration of which is necessary to illustrate their account. To these facts we will attend, so far as they may be ascertained or probably conjectured.

Our Lord's marvellous control over nature must have affected most powerfully the minds of his countrymen. It was not doubted or denied. His enemies ascribed it to diabolical agency, the belief in magic being universal in that age ; and they consequently must have regarded him with dread, as a magician of most extraordinary and undefined powers. This dread was undoubtedly qualified by the whole complexion of his character, and by the essential benevolence of his miracles ; but if they proceeded to violence against him, they could not be assured that he would not use his powers for the destruction of those who attempted to perpetrate it. He might call down fire from heaven upon them, as it was told in their history that Elijah did upon the bands of soldiers that Ahaziah sent to seize him.

The Jews employed to apprehend our Lord could not have been free from such terrors. A large number were consequently collected, and the aid of a band of Roman soldiers was obtained. These, it may have been thought, would be more free from such fears as were felt by the countrymen of Jesus, who were better acquainted with the miracles which he had wrought. The whole body, according to the account of Luke (ch. xxii. 52), was accompanied by some members of the Sanhedrim, by which it had been sent.

The state of apprehension arising from a dread of those powers which Jesus might put forth may be inferred from the

numerous band thus collected to arrest an unarmed individual, surrounded only by a few followers, who were wholly unprepared to repel any attack upon their Master.

This large body of men, upon arriving at the garden where Jesus was, did not at once enter it and close round him and seize him. Probably the larger number halted without the garden, to wait the event, and to give aid, if aid were necessary, or if it might be available. Judas entered the garden with a smaller body, sufficient to effect his purpose, if it were not intercepted by supernatural power.

With the depraved hardness of feeling that belonged to his character, and with the desperation that attends the commission of an infamous act, he went up to his Master and gave the concerted sign. But his followers still hesitated to lay hold on Jesus. Our Lord, therefore, advanced toward them, and addressed to them the question, "Whom are you seeking?"

"They answered him, Jesus the Nazarene. Jesus said to them, I am he. Then, upon his saying to them, I am he, they retreated and fell to the ground."

The intrepidity, calmness, and dignity of his manner confirmed and quickened their feelings of dread; and, instead of apprehending him, they retreated in such haste, that some or many of them stumbled and fell to the ground.

Jesus addressed them again; and they, having, as we may suppose, in some degree recovered from their terror, when they found that no evil had fallen upon them, answered him as before. His words to them then implied that no resistance was to be feared from him: "If, then, you are seeking me, let these men go."

Peter, meanwhile, with his ardent temper and his devotion to his Master, having witnessed the terror with which Jesus

had affected those who came to apprehend him, began to use his sword in his defence. Without the expectation that his Master was about to exert his own power for his deliverance, all hope of resistance, by merely human means, was evidently vain. But he relied on him as the Messiah, who would save himself and his followers if they were true to his cause.

He was, however, immediately checked by his Master. The words addressed to Peter, as well as those addressed to the persons who came to apprehend him, made it evident that he intended no resistance. They gathered courage; the band of Roman soldiers with their officer came up, and Jesus was seized upon.

3. “Judas, then, taking the band of soldiers,” &c.

“— *the* band of soldiers”:—that is, of Roman soldiers, for whose employment the Sanhedrim must have obtained an order from Pilate,—probably under the pretence that Jesus was exciting a sedition. Of the use of the article (“*the* band”) I have seen no plausible explanation. I suppose it to refer to what was definite in the mind of the Evangelist, and in the minds of many of his contemporary readers, and to mean the well-known band, which, as those readers had learned from the other Gospels or from oral relations, had been sent to apprehend Jesus. We have before had occasion to observe in the Gospels similar references to what was distinct in the mind of the writer, and to what he assumed to be known to his readers.

6. “Then, upon his saying to them, I am he, they retreated and fell to the ground.”

“They retreated and fell to the ground.” That is, a part of ~~them~~ fell to the ground. Such is the general want of precision

in the language of the Evangelists, that there is no difficulty in this explanation. Throughout the Gospels propositions very frequently occur, which are expressed in universal terms respecting bodies of men, but which are evidently meant to be understood only of some of their number.

14. See ch. xi. 49, 50.

17. “Are you one of this man’s disciples?”

Μὴ καὶ σὺ, κ. τ. λ. Καί is used *intensively* (see the note on Matthew xxvi. 69); and no equivalent to it is required in this interrogation.

20. “I have ever taught in synagogues,” &c.

“— in synagogues”: — verbally, “in a synagogue.”

23. “Jesus said to him, If my teaching has been bad, testify to what was bad.”

“If my teaching has been bad,” Εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα. “Putem potius verbum λαλεῖν referendum esse non ad Jesu sermonem cum pontifice, sed ad universam ejus doctrinam. Erat enim quæstio περὶ διδαχῆς, v. 19. Ipse Jesus, v. 20, verbum λαλεῖν bis permutat cum διδάσκειν. Rursus, v. 21, λαλεῖν significat *docere*. Quidni igitur idem verbum v. 23 eodem sensu accipiamus, et vertamus: *Si male docui, demonstra, cet.*” — De constanti et æquabili J. C. Indole, Doctrina et Docendi Ratione, s. Comm. de Evang. Joan. cum Matth. Marc. et Luc. Evang. comparato, ab E. A. Borger, p. 84, not.

24. “Annas had sent him bound to Caiaphas the high-priest.”

These words are parenthetical. As is remarked by Grotius

their purpose is to say, that Annas sent him *bound*. The fact is mentioned here, because this indignity and prejudgment of the case of Jesus led to and countenanced the indignity just before mentioned.

The true bearing of the words not being understood, the particle *οὖν*, “then,” has been inserted in many manuscripts, producing a false connection, to avoid which it has in modern times been erroneously rendered by “now,” in the Common Version, and others.

25. Note the indefinite subject of *εἶπον*. See also verse 28, *ἄγουσιν*. Compare the note on Matthew xxvii. 18.

28. “Then, early in the morning, they carried Jesus from Caiaphas to the Prætorium. And they did not themselves enter the Prætorium, lest they should be defiled, and prevented from eating the Passover.”

It has been contended that the account of John does not correspond with that of the first three Evangelists, respecting the time when our Saviour kept the Passover, and the day on which he was crucified. It is said that, according to John, he anticipated the usual time of keeping the Passover, and was crucified on the day of preparation for the Passover; while according to the other Evangelists he kept the Passover at the usual time. The main arguments for this opinion in regard to the account of John are derived from this verse, from ch. xix. 14, and from ch. xiii. 1.

In respect to the last passage (xiii. 1), the difficulty which has been supposed to exist is removed by a proper construction and rendering.

For the explanation of ch. xix. 14, see the note on that verse.

In the present verse the words *ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα*, verbally, “that they might eat the Passover,” are to be thus explained.

The name “Passover” was familiarly extended to the whole Feast of Unleavened Bread, which was regarded as continuing for either seven or eight days, according as the particular day of the Passover, the fourteenth of Nisan, was or was not included in the computation. During this period, unleavened bread was eaten, and thank-offerings were made, of the flesh of which the offerers partook. Such offerings were particularly made on the fifteenth day of Nisan, the day after the Passover, the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the anniversary of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, a day which, conformably to the Levitical Law (Leviticus xxiii. 6–8, Numbers xxviii. 17–25), the Jews celebrated as especially sacred.

The fifteenth of Nisan was the day on which our Lord suffered. Peculiar, consecrated food, appropriate to the paschal festival, namely, unleavened bread and portions of the thank-offerings, were to be eaten on that day. We may, therefore, without difficulty, understand the words “to eat the Passover,” not in their most restricted sense, as meaning “to eat the paschal lamb,” but in a more general sense, as meaning “to eat the food appropriate to the paschal festival,” with particular reference to the sacrifices of thanksgiving which, in the morning of the fifteenth of Nisan, were about to be offered during the day. In assigning the words this meaning, nothing is supposed which is not conformable to the ordinary use of language, nothing but a figure of speech of a very common kind, the meaning of which is obvious, as soon as we understand that the words relate to the desire of the enemies of Jesus to keep

themselves from pollution on the morning of the fifteenth of Nisan.

The following examples have been adduced, by different writers, of the use of language *specially* analogous to that of St. John.

In the law of Deuteronomy (ch. xvi. 2, 3) respecting the Passover, it is said: "Thou shalt sacrifice the Passover of the flock *and the herd*." Here the name Passover is extended beyond the paschal lamb to include other sacrifices offered during the paschal festival, and it is added: "Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread with it," — that is, with the Passover, which it appears, therefore, was to be eaten for seven days.

In 2 Chronicles xxx. 22 we find in the Common Version the rendering, "They did eat throughout the feast seven days." The original verbally rendered is, "They ate the festival" (the festival was the Passover) "seven days."

In the same chapter (verse 17), the paschal lambs or kids are called, in the plural, "passovers." The same name, "passovers," rendered in the Common Version "passover offerings," is extended, in ch. xxxv. 8–11, to the thank-offerings of the paschal festival.

In the rendering of this passage in the Septuagint, which does not altogether correspond with the Hebrew, it is said that *sheep*, lambs, kids, and *oxen* were all given "for the Passover"; and the meaning of the word "Passover," as not signifying the paschal festival, but the animals sacrificed on this occasion, is determined by the writer's going on to say, "And they sacrificed the Passover." Under the name "Passover," therefore, were intended the animals offered as thank-offerings.

It is true that, in this passage of Chronicles, in the thirteenth

verse, "the Passover" is used in its restricted sense, to denote only the lamb or kid sacrificed for the paschal supper, which is here distinguished from the thank-offerings. There is no doubt that the word was used in this sense; the question is, whether it were used also in a more extended sense. That it was so, is, I think, evident from the preceding verses; and all, therefore, that we can conclude from the thirteenth verse is, that the author of the book was not careful to keep distinct the more restricted and the more extended use of the term, — a sort of care which we are not to expect in the writers either of the Old or of the New Testament.

Mosheim, in a note to his Latin translation of Cudworth's treatise "On the True Notion of the Lord's Supper" (pp. 858, 859), professes that he thinks it probable that in Deuteronomy xvi. 2 the name "Passover" comprehends not merely the animals for the paschal supper, but "those of the herd," the oxen, which were to be sacrificed on occasion of the paschal solemnity. But as regards the application of that passage to illustrate the words of John, he says that it cannot be inferred from it that the name Passover was ever used "absolutely" to denote the thank-offerings of the Passover, considered apart from the paschal supper. The remark has been repeatedly praised for its acuteness, as by Kuinoel and Strauss. But in fact it only implies a forgetfulness of a very common metonymy, by which the name of a whole is given to a part. If, when the paschal festival were half over, it had been said, that certain Jews desired to avoid pollution that they might "keep the Passover," every one perceives that the expression would be unobjectionable, though no one would think of applying the name Passover "absolutely" to the last three or four days of the festival.



29. "Pilate then came out to them and said, What accusation do you bring against this man?"

Pilate has not before been named by John; but is here mentioned, without explanation, as supposed by the Evangelist to be well known.

37. "I was born for this end and for this end have I come to the world, to bear testimony to the Truth."

See the note on ch. viii. 32.

XIX. 4. "Lo! I am bringing him out to you, to let you know that I do not find him guilty of any crime."

That is, that you may perceive that I regard him only as an object of mockery, incapable of committing such a crime against the government as you charge him with.

13, 17. The insertion of the Hebrew words in this manner shows that Gentile readers were expected by a Jewish writer.

14. "It was toward noon on the Preparation-day of the paschal week."

"The Preparation-day of the paschal week." This I believe is the true rendering of the words of the original. But the term there used has been understood as meaning the preparation, or the day of preparation, for the Passover; and hence, as according to the first three Evangelists the Passover was celebrated by the Jews the night before our Lord's crucifixion,

there has been supposed to be an important discrepance between them and St. John.

This supposition has been connected with the common notion, that the Jews in the time of our Lord began and ended their day at sunset. (See the note on Matthew xxvi. 2.) It may resolve itself into either of two others.

Our Lord was crucified on Friday. If it be thought that St. John considered this as the day of preparation for the Passover, it may be supposed, either that Friday was the fourteenth day of Nisan, ending at sunset, after which time, that is, during the night which was the commencement of Saturday, the fifteenth of Nisan, the paschal lamb was eaten, — or that Friday was the thirteenth of Nisan, that Saturday was the fourteenth, the day of the Passover, and that after sunset on Saturday, during the first part of Sunday, the lamb was eaten. I do not know, however, that any writer has fairly stated at length the latter conjecture.

But one need not hesitate to affirm, that both suppositions are wholly untenable. In regard to the first, it is only necessary to observe, that the fourteenth day of Nisan, whenever it began and ended, was the day of the Passover; that it was ordained to be so in the Old Testament; that it is so designated by Josephus; that there is no question that it was universally recognized as such; that it was consequently so recognized by John; and that therefore it is utterly incredible that he should, in this solitary instance, have gone out of his way to call the fourteenth of Nisan, the proper day of the Passover, by the name of “the Preparation for the Passover,” even if any ground can be imagined for giving it that name.*

* With regard to any ground there may be for giving it this name,

To the second supposition, that the day in question was the thirteenth day of Nisan, there are the objections, that no preparation for the Passover was required to be made on that day; that there is no pretence of any evidence that that day was ever called “the Preparation for the Passover”; and that, supposing the Friday on which our Lord was crucified to have been the thirteenth of Nisan, the paschal feast could not in any sense be spoken of as having commenced; but that it had commenced is evident from the proposal of Pilate (related by St. John, ch. xix. 31, in common with the other Evangelists) to release Jesus, in conformity with the custom of releasing one prisoner during the Passover.

The verbal rendering of the term used by St. John, namely, “the Preparation of the Passover,” or “the Preparation-day of the Passover,” undoubtedly presents a difficulty; but this is removed as soon as we understand that “the Preparation,” ἡ Παρασκευή, was in Hellenistic Greek the distinctive name of Friday, because on this day preparation was made for the Jewish Sabbath,—as, in like manner, in the Rabbinical dialect it was distinguished by a name, עֵרֵב שַׁבָּת, which may be rendered “the Eve,” because the observance of the Sabbath commenced on Friday evening. These two were appropriate names of Friday, as “the Sabbath” was of Saturday. The other days of the week were denoted simply by their order of succession, as the first, second, third, and so on. (See Wetstein’s note on Matthew xxvii. 62, and Buxtorf’s *Lexicon Talmudicum*.)

consult Reland, *Antiq. Hebr. Pars IV. c. 3*, p. 456; Winer, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, II. 341; Lightfoot on Mark xiv. 12, *Opp. II.* 457, 458; Buxtorf, *Lexicon Talmudicum*, coll. 1023, 1659.

The following are some of the examples of this use of ἡ Παρασκευή, "the Preparation," as the proper name of Friday.

Josephus reports that Augustus sent a circular letter to the governors of different provinces, expressing his favor toward the Jews. Of this he gives a copy, and in this it was ordered that "the Jews should not be held to answer bail on the Sabbath, nor on *the Preparation* preceding it, after the ninth hour." (Antiq. Jud. Lib. XVI. c. 6. § 2.)

Irenæus incidentally speaks of the sixth day of the week as being "*the Preparation*." (Cont. Hæres. Lib. I. c. 14. § 6. p. 71, ed. Massuet.)

The true Gnostic, says Clement of Alexandria, "understands the mystery of the fast on these days, the fourth and *the Preparation*, the first of which is called the day of Mercury, and the second the day of Venus." (Stromat. VII. § 12. p. 877.) In his note on this passage, Potter gives, or refers to, other proofs of the same use of this name.

Origen, remarking on Exodus xvi. 5, says: "It appears that the name of 'the sixth day' is given to the day before the Sabbath, which among us is called *the Preparation*." (Homil. in Exod. VII. § 5. Opp. II. 153, E.)

In the sixty-ninth Apostolical Canon, it is ordained, that, if any one holding an ecclesiastical office "do not fast on the fourth day of the week, or on *the Preparation*, he shall be deposed."

Augustine speaks of "the Preparation," (which he says was in his time called by the Jews in Latin *cæna pura*,) "that is," he says, "the sixth day of the week."

Other passages to the same effect are given by Suicer in his Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, under the words παρασκευή and νηστεία.

This name of Friday was known to the Heathens, as appears

not merely from the use of it in the letter of Augustus, but from a passage of the physician Dioscorides (quoted by Wetstein). He says that the Syrians recommend a certain medicine as a remedy for fevers, "to be given on the second day of the week, the fourth, and *the Preparation*."

It is clear that by "the Preparation" on which our Saviour was crucified the first three Evangelists mean Friday, the day before the Sabbath, as the name is explained by Mark (ch. xv. 42), for the benefit of his Gentile readers. (Compare Matthew xxvii. 62; Luke xxiii. 54.) John, likewise, says that the day of the crucifixion was "the Preparation." He uses this name three times; in the verse before us, and in verses 31 and 42. It would be very extraordinary, if, in speaking of the same day, Friday, he had happened to use the proper name of that day in a sense different from its common one and from that in which it is used by the other Evangelists, and especially in a sense — as meaning not Friday, but the preparation-day for the day of the Passover — of which no other example has been adduced.

I have rendered "the Preparation-day of *the paschal week*." The term Passover was familiarly used to denote, either the paschal lamb, or the day on which it was eaten (the fourteenth of Nisan), or the seven or eight days during which the Feast of Unleavened Bread continued.

As I have said, no example has been adduced of the use of the term ἡ Παρασκευή, "the Preparation," to denote the day of the Passover, or the day before the Passover, or the day preceding any other of the great national feasts. It was the proper name of Friday, as much so as "the Sabbath" was of Saturday. The term used by John, therefore, is equivalent to "the Friday of the paschal week."

["All that precedes," says a manuscript memorandum of the

author, "to be written over. State more clearly the absurdity of supposing that the day of the Passover was called the day of Preparation for the Passover."]

See the notes on ch. xiii. 1 and xviii. 28.

38, 39. (Joseph of Arimathæa and Nicodemus.)

We have no knowledge of Joseph of Arimathæa except what this and the corresponding mention of him by the first three Evangelists affords, and none of Nicodemus except what is derived from this passage and the former notices of him by St. John (ch. iii. and vii. 50). The conduct of Joseph and Nicodemus makes it evident that they regarded Jesus as a prophet, like those prophets of old whom the Jews had persecuted and killed; and perhaps as a precursor of the Messiah. In rendering these honors to his body, they would consequently think that they were doing what was acceptable to God. But as we find no further mention of them, it is not probable that they afterward openly joined the number of his professed followers.

39. "And Nicodemus brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, of about a hundred pounds' weight."

That is, about a hundred Roman pounds, equal to seventy-five pounds avoirdupois. This weight of aromatics, Nicodemus, we must suppose, had caused to be brought by one or more slaves.

Our information concerning ancient usages and the circumstances of this particular case is too deficient to enable us to answer all the questions which the brief account of the Evangelist may suggest. — Of myrrh there were different sorts, of which Pliny gives the prices as being from ten to sixteen de-

narii the Roman pound. Of the aromatic aloes, there were likewise different sorts, but we do not know the price of any one of them, nor do we know in what proportion the aloes was mixed with the myrrh. But should we compute the cost of the whole mixture at the average cost of the myrrh, it would amount to about two hundred dollars. There is no improbability that Nicodemus, who was evidently acting under strong excitement, should have expended this sum in the interment of one whom he wished to honor as a prophet.

But the question arises, how a quantity of aromatics, weighing a hundred pounds, was used. It is not said that it was all used. Everything was done in haste; and Nicodemus may have despatched different servants to purchase aromatics where they could find them, and they may have brought a larger quantity than was needed. But if the Evangelist had expressly said that the whole quantity was used in wrapping up the body, we should have nothing to object to this statement, either from any intrinsic difficulty in conceiving how such a weight of aromatics might be thus disposed of, or from any knowledge we possess that such a quantity was not so used in costly interments. We may, however, suppose, as has been done, that a large portion of it was used to form a layer in the niche in which the body was placed.

In modern times, as I have implied, the account of St. John has been objected to on the ground that the quantity of aromatics mentioned by him is excessive. But it has been objected to without any knowledge of the quantity commonly used by the rich among the Jews in the interment of the dead, or of what might reasonably be believed to have been done under the circumstances of the present case. On the contrary, I cannot find that the account was considered by any ancient

Christian writer as requiring explanation or defence, or that it was objected to by any ancient adversary of Christianity. If it be the fact, as I have no doubt it is, that it was not thus remarked upon, it follows that there is nothing in the account which to those familiar with ancient usages seemed strange or improbable.

I notice, because I have repeatedly seen it quoted, the assertion of a modern Jew, Jacob ben Amram, who wrote in the seventeenth century. He says, that the weight of aromatics (amounting, as has been mentioned, to about seventy-five pounds avoirdupois) was a load for a mule, and too heavy for Nicodemus to carry. This requires no remark in addition to what has been said. But he adds, that the quantity was sufficient for two hundred dead bodies. On this it is only necessary to observe, that the assertion is made at random ; for Jacob ben Amram had no more knowledge than any other modern writer, either of what was the least quantity used by the poor, or what was the largest quantity used by the rich, among the Jews, in the interment of their dead.

XX. 1-18. (The Resurrection.)

Compare Matthew xxviii. 1-10 ; Mark xvi. 1-8 ; Luke xxiv. 1-12.

The accounts given by the four Evangelists of the circumstances attending our Lord's resurrection are brief and incomplete, and do not, I think, admit of being perfectly adjusted together into one narrative. We cannot well doubt that, in a time of such excitement and agitation of feeling, the reports of the women who visited his tomb were imperfectly made and imperfectly understood. It is not probable, moreover, that any one of the Gospels was written till after a lapse of thirty

years from the time of our Lord's resurrection ; and the absorbing character of that main event, of such infinitely greater importance than any circumstances that were connected with it, very likely prevented those circumstances, even so far as they were understood at the time, from being steadily fixed in the memory of the disciples.

St. John evidently had more personal knowledge of the events of the morning of the resurrection than Matthew, the only other Apostle who has left an account of them. According to him, Mary of Magdala went very early in the morning to the tomb. She was accompanied, as the first three Evangelists mention, by other women, followers and friends of our Lord. St. John, as we may presume, mentions her alone, because she was the most conspicuous and active among them, and brought to the Apostles the first news of the state in which they found the tomb. But he did not conceive of her as having made her visit unaccompanied, to have done which * * * *

The words which he ascribes to her imply that he knew she was not alone. "They have taken the Master from the tomb, and *we* know not where they have laid him."

* * * * *

Matthew and Mark speak of the appearance of one angel, Luke and John of two ; and the accounts respecting the angel or angels are different in the different Evangelists. The mention of but one angel may be explained by the circumstance that it was by one only that the women were addressed. Him they would have principally in mind, from him they would report the message to the Apostles, and the presence of the other was a circumstance comparatively unimportant.

* * * * *

1. “Mary of Magdala came, and saw that the stone had been taken away from the tomb.”

Note the coincidence with Matthew (xxvii. 60) and Mark (xv. 46). John has not before mentioned the stone.

16. “Rabboni! — which means *Teacher*.”

An explanation for Gentile readers.

23. “Whosoever sins you may remit are remitted, and whosoever sins you may not remit are not remitted.”

See the note on Matthew xvi. 19.

28. “Thomas answered him, My Master and my God!”

“An argument has been founded by Trinitarians upon the exclamation of the Apostle Thomas when convinced of the truth of his Master’s resurrection: ‘And Thomas said to him, My Master! and my God!’ Both titles, I believe, were applied by him to Jesus. But the name ‘God’ was employed by him, not as the proper name of the Deity, but as an appellative, according to a common use of it in his day; * or perhaps in a

* [This use of the word ‘God’ as an appellative or common name is referred to by our Saviour, John x. 34–36; compare Psalm lxxxii. 1, 6. See also Exodus vii. 1; 1 Samuel xxviii. 13; Psalm xlv. 6, 7, comp. Hebrews i. 8, 9. In Exodus xxi. 6, and xxii. 8, 9, it is applied to magistrates, and is translated in the Common Version “judges”; compare Exodus xxii. 28; 1 Samuel ii. 25. See also Psalm lxxxvi. 8; cxxxvi. 2; cxxxviii. 1.]

figurative sense, as it sometimes occurs in modern writers, of which the passages before quoted from Young afford examples.* I have already had occasion to remark upon the different significancy of the term 'God' in ancient and in modern times, a difference important to be well understood in order to ascertain the meaning of ancient authors.† The name 'God' is an appellative in the Old Testament; and it is a characteristic and peculiar distinction of the *writers* of the New Testament, when compared with those who preceded and followed them, that they used this name as it is used by enlightened Christians at the present day.

"But the argument deserves notice as illustrating the very loose reasoning which has been resorted to in bringing passages from the Old and the New Testament in support of false doctrines. Supposing that Thomas *had* believed, and asserted, that his Master was God himself; in what way should this affect our faith? We should still know the fact on which his belief was founded, the fact of the resurrection of his Master, and could draw our own inferences from it, and judge whether his were well founded. Considering into how great an error

* [See Statement of Reasons, p. 108. The passages there quoted from Young are the following:—

"The death-bed of the just
Is it his death-bed? No; it is his shrine:
Behold him there just rising to a God."

Night Thoughts, II. 629.

"Shall we this moment gaze on God in man;
The next, lose man for ever in the dust?"

Ibid., VII. 222.]

† See on this subject Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. III. Additional Note D, "On the Use of the Words *θεός* and *Deus*."

he had fallen in his previous obstinate incredulity, there would be little reason for relying upon his opinion as infallible in the case supposed. I make these remarks, not from any doubt about the meaning of his words, but, as I have said, for the purpose of pointing out one example of that incomplete and unsatisfactory mode of reasoning, which appears in the use of many quotations from the Old and the New Testament." — *Statement of Reasons*, pp. 226, 227.

Ch. XXI. (Appearance of Jesus to his disciples at the lake of Tiberias.)

The narrative in the twenty-first chapter was not, I conceive, originally a part of the Gospel, but was added as a supplement by John.

7. "And Simon Peter, on hearing that it was the Master, girt round him his outer tunic, for he was without his cloak, and leaped into the lake."

"— for he was without his cloak." See Winer's *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, I. 662, and Gesenius's note on Isaiah xx. 2. *Γυμνός*, "naked," like *nudus*, was used concerning one who had on only a tunic.

12. "And no one of the disciples had confidence to make inquiry who he was; for they knew that it was the Master."

We must, as I suppose, conceive of the scene thus. The disciples had just brought their boat to shore. Jesus, in the dusk of the morning, was standing at some distance from them. No one of them, not even Peter, had yet approached him.

They, therefore, had not yet recognized him by his personal appearance. But, though he was giving them directions, and inviting them to come and take food, no one of them obeyed the natural impulse of asking him who he was, "for they knew that it was the Master."

22. "If it be my will that he remain till I come," &c.

The meaning is, If it be my will that he should not die a violent death, but should remain till I come to receive him to myself. Compare John xiv. 3.

See, on this passage, Appendix, Note E, p. 533.

24. "This is the disciple who testifies to these things, and has written this account."

These last words refer, as I suppose, merely to the account immediately preceding, not to the whole of the Gospel.

IN our present copies of the Gospel of John we find the following addition : —

"And we know that his testimony is true. And there are many other things that Jesus did, which, if they were severally written, I do not think that the world itself would contain the books written."

"It is hardly to be supposed, that the Apostle would say of himself, '*We* know that *his* testimony is true,' subjoining immediately after, '*I* do not think.' This is not the style of any writer in speaking of himself. The extravagant hyperbole in the second sentence, also, is foreign from the style of St. John. The passage appears to be an editorial note, which, written, probably, at first a little separate from the text, became incorporated with it at a very early period.

“ According to ancient accounts, St. John wrote his Gospel at Ephesus, over the church in which city he presided during the latter part of his long life. It is not improbable that, before his death, its circulation had been confined to the members of that church. Thence copies of it would be afterwards obtained ; and the copy provided for transcription was, we may suppose, accompanied by the strong attestation which we now find, given by the church, or the elders of the church, to their full faith in the accounts which it contained, and by the concluding remark made by the writer of this attestation in his own person.

“ There is no external authority, properly speaking, for rejecting this passage. In one manuscript, the last verse is omitted ; and in several others, it is said to have been thought by some to be an addition. The character of the language, however, is different from that of John.* ” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. Additional Note A, Section V. ix. pp. xcvi, xcvi.

“ * The use of ὅσα (*whatever*), as equivalent simply to the relative ἃ (*which, that*), is not common, and does not occur elsewhere in John. It was accordingly changed to ἃ by Origen, Chrysostom, and Cyril ; and ἃ is substituted for it in the Vatican and other manuscripts. Καθ' ἑν is nowhere else found in what was probably written by the Apostle. (It occurs once in the Apocalypse ; and εἰς καθ' εἰς is a various reading in the interpolated passage in the eighth chapter of his Gospel.) It is here used illogically, its proper meaning being *one by one, severally* ; whereas the meaning intended is *all*. Οἶμαι (in this form) occurs nowhere else in the New Testament or Septuagint ; nor is any form of οἶμαι elsewhere used by John.”

APPENDIX.

A P P E N D I X.

NOTE A.

(See p. 23.)

THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF THE PRESENT GREEK GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

“THERE is no doubt that these chapters have always made a part of our Greek translation; but this does not decide the question, whether they proceeded from the Apostle. As has been already suggested,* they may have been an ancient document, written in Hebrew, originally a separate work, but which, on account of its small size and the connection of its subject, was transcribed into manuscripts of the Hebrew original of Matthew, till in time it became blended with his Gospel as a part of it, in some copies, one or more of which came into the hands of his translator.

“The first point, then, to be attended to in this inquiry, is, that a large portion of the Jewish Christians did not believe the miraculous conception of our Lord, and had not the account of it, that is, the two chapters in question, in their copies of Matthew’s Gospel. There was nothing in their prejudices or habits of mind which could have led them to reject the belief of that fact, and especially to mutilate their Gospel in order to

* See before, p. 5.

get rid of the account of it. But if this be so, as it is altogether improbable that the two chapters would be lost by accident from any number of copies, it follows that they were an addition to the original in the copies in which they were found, and not an omission in those in which they were wanting.

“The chapters themselves are next to be examined, in order to determine whether the narrative contained in them is such as we can believe to have proceeded from the Apostle; and, in doing so, we must compare it with the account of the nativity given by Luke, which, there is no plausible reason for doubting, always made a part of his Gospel.” — *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. Additional Note A, Section V. 1. pp. lvi, lvii.

For such an examination and comparison, see what follows in the work just quoted.

“BUT, if we reject the two chapters, a difficulty arises; as the original Hebrew Gospel could not have commenced with the first words of the third chapter,—‘But in those days.’ The difficulty, however, is removed by considering that these words may have been added as a form of transition to a new subject, when the two chapters were blended with the Gospel, and that the Gospel may originally have begun with the words that follow: ‘John the Baptist came preaching in the Desert of Judæa’; that is, in a manner corresponding to the commencement of Mark’s Gospel. Or the first words may originally have been, ‘In the days of Herod,’ meaning Herod the tetrarch of Galilee, which supposition is, perhaps, countenanced by the story of Epiphanius, before mentioned, that the Gospel of the Ebionites began, ‘In the days of Herod, *king of Judæa*’; the addition of which last words, *king of Judæa*, seems to have been a blunder of his own.

“But the commencement of the third chapter, ‘In those days,’ presents a more serious difficulty upon the supposition that what precedes was written by Matthew. The last events mentioned at the close of the second chapter are the accession of Archelaus as ruler of Judæa, and Joseph’s going to reside at Nazareth. But it was not in the time of those events, it was not ‘in those days’; on the contrary, it was about thirty years afterward, that John the Baptist was preaching in the Desert of Judæa.” — *Ibid.*, pp. lxii, lxiii.

FOR some remarks on Strauss’s discussion of the difficulties in these two chapters, in his “Life of Jesus,” see Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, pp. 87 – 95.

THE chapters in question may be thus translated.

“THE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF DAVID,
THE SON OF ABRAHAM.

“Abraham was the father of Isaac; and Isaac was the father of Jacob; and Jacob was the father of Judah and his brothers; and Judah was the father of Pharez and Zarah, by Tamar; and Pharez was the father of Hezron; and Hezron was the father of Aram; and Aram was the father of Amminadab; and Amminadab was the father of Nahshon; and Nahshon was the father of Salmon; and Salmon was the father of Boaz, by Rahab; and Boaz was the father of Obed, by Ruth; and Obed was the father of Jesse; and Jesse was the father of David the king.

“And David the king was the father of Solomon, by the wife of Uriah; and Solomon was the father of Rehoboam; and Rehoboam was the father of Abiah; and Abiah was the father of

Asa ; and Asa was the father of Jehoshaphat ; and Jehoshaphat was the father of Jehoram ; and Jehoram was the father of Uzziah ; and Uzziah was the father of Jotham ; and Jotham was the father of Ahaz ; and Ahaz was the father of Hezekiah ; and Hezekiah was the father of Manasseh ; and Manasseh was the father of Amon ; and Amon was the father of Josiah ; and Josiah was the father of Jeconiah and his brothers, at the time of the removal to Babylon.

“ And after the removal to Babylon, Jeconiah was the father of Salathiel ; and Salathiel was the father of Zerubbabel ; and Zerubbabel was the father of Abiud ; and Abiud was the father of Eliakim ; and Eliakim was the father of Azor ; and Azor was the father of Zadok ; and Zadok was the father of Achim ; and Achim was the father of Eliud ; and Eliud was the father of Eleazar ; and Eleazar was the father of Matthan ; and Matthan was the father of Jacob ; and Jacob was the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

“ So all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations ; from David till the removal to Babylon, fourteen generations ; and from the removal to Babylon to the time of Christ, fourteen generations.

“ THE birth of Jesus Christ was thus. After his mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph, before they came together, she was found to be with child by the power of God. Then Joseph, to whom she was betrothed, being a good man, and not wishing to expose her to shame, purposed to put her away privately. But while he had this in mind, lo ! an angel of the LORD appeared to him in a dream, and said, Joseph, son of David, fear not to take Mary as thy wife ; for she has conceived

through the power of God, and will bear a son ; and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he will deliver his people from their sins.* All this took place, to fulfil what was said by the LORD through the prophet : *Lo ! the virgin will conceive and bear a son, and they will call his name IMMANUEL†* (which means, *God-is-with-us*). And Joseph, awaking from sleep, did as the angel of the LORD had directed him, and took home his wife. And he knew her not, till she had brought forth her first-born son ; and he called his name Jesus.

“ AFTER the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem in Judæa, in the days of Herod the king, lo ! Magi from the East came to Jerusalem, saying, Where is the new-born king of the Jews ? for we saw his star in the East, and have come to pay him reverence. When Herod the king heard of this, he was greatly moved, and all Jerusalem with him. And assembling all the chief priests and teachers of the Law among the people, he inquired of them where the Messiah was to be born. And they answered him, At Bethlehem in Judæa ; for thus it has been written by the prophet : *And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art by no means the least among the chiefs of Judah ; for out of thee shall come a ruler, who shall be the shepherd of my people Israel.‡*

“ Then Herod, having privately called the Magi, ascertained from them the time when the star appeared. And he sent them to Bethlehem, saying, Go and search out the child carefully, and when you have found him, inform me, that I also

* [The translation of these chapters was here left unfinished by Mr. Norton. The remainder is by another hand.]

† Isaiah vii. 14.

‡ Micah v. 2

may go and pay him reverence. Having heard the king, they departed; and lo! the star which they had seen in the East went before them, till it stood over the place where the child was. And when they saw the star, they were filled with great joy. And entering the house, they saw the child with Mary his mother, and falling down before him they paid him reverence. And opening their caskets, they presented him gifts,—gold, and frankincense, and myrrh. And having been divinely warned in a dream not to return to Herod, they went back to their own country another way.

“After they had gone, lo! an angel of the LORD appeared to Joseph in a dream, and said, Arise, and take the child and his mother, and fly to Egypt, and remain there till I speak to thee; for Herod is about to make search for the child to destroy him. And he arose and took the child and his mother by night, and went to Egypt, where he remained till the death of Herod; to fulfil what was said by the LORD through the prophet: *Out of Egypt I called my son.**

“Then Herod, perceiving that he had been made light of by the Magi, was very angry, and sent and destroyed all the male children in Bethlehem and in all its territory who were two years old and under, according to the time which he had ascertained from the Magi. Then was fulfilled what was said by Jeremiah the prophet: *A cry was heard in Ramah,† weeping, and great lamentation; Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted, because they were no more.*‡

* Hosea xi. 1.

† The words *θρῆνος καί*, which follow in the Received Text, are omitted in the above translation as probably spurious.

‡ Jeremiah xxxi. 15.

“ But after the death of Herod, lo ! an angel of the LORD appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, and said, Arise, and take the child and his mother, and go to the land of Israel ; for those who sought the child’s life are dead. And he arose, and took the child and his mother, and came to the land of Israel. But having heard that Archelaus was reigning over Judæa in the place of Herod his father, he was afraid to go there ; and being divinely warned in a dream, he went to Galilee, and took up his abode in a town called Nazareth ; to fulfil what was said by the prophets, *He will be called a Nazarene.*”

NOTE B.*

(See pp. 55, 101, 119, 250, 262, 354, 356, 364.)

ON THE CHRONOLOGICAL ARRANGEMENT OF THE EVENTS
RECORDED BY THE EVANGELISTS.

IN the first place, I suppose that Mark and Luke were not well acquainted with the chronological order of events, and are in error, generally or always, when they differ in their arrangement from Matthew. See *Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. cxvi, seqq. ; p. clxxx, seqq. ; and compare p. xciii, seqq.

I believe, on the other hand, a chronological order to be *the basis* of Matthew's arrangement. In John's Gospel such an order, I think, is evidently followed.

The question then is, How are the events recorded by these two Evangelists to be adjusted together? We will begin with the *first* Passover in our Lord's ministry, mentioned by John in his second chapter.

After this Passover, as John relates (ch. iii. 22), our Lord remained in Judæa, I suppose for two or three weeks. He then left Judæa and went to Galilee. (John iv. 3, 43, seqq.) Here Matthew's narrative, ch. iv. 12, commences.

To this it may be objected, that John, speaking of a time after the Passover, says (ch. iii. 24), "John was not yet put in

* [The following note is taken from a manuscript letter, written in answer to an inquiry respecting the subject to which it relates. This will explain the character of the style, and the brevity with which some points are treated.]

prison ”; and that Matthew says (ch. iv. 12) that Jesus, “hearing that John was apprehended, removed to Galilee.”

The answer is, that, though John the Baptist had not been put in prison at the commencement of the interval of two or three weeks which I have supposed, there is no reason for believing that he may not have been so before its close. John says nothing irreconcilable with what is said by Matthew. On the contrary, the only way in which we can account for his parenthetical remark, that “John was not yet put in prison,” is by supposing that John *was* put in prison *very soon* after the Passover, and that the Evangelist, being aware of this fact, and supposing his readers might be aware of it, meant to say in effect, that, though such was the case, there was still a short period after the Passover, a few days, or a week or two, or even more time, during which he continued to baptize.

The limits within which I must confine myself do not allow me to enlarge on any one topic. From John iv. 1 – 3 it appears that our Lord considered himself to be in danger because he was becoming more conspicuous than the Baptist. One of two things follows: the Baptist either was in danger, or had already incurred the penalty of his boldness as a reformer. The latter inference, which there is nothing to render improbable, coincides with the statement of Matthew.

The words in John iv. 35, which some have considered as a note of the period of the year, I regard as a mere proverbial expression.

Returning, then, to Matthew, and proceeding with his narrative, we do come to a clear, though somewhat indeterminate, note of time, in the account of the disciples’ plucking ears of grain to eat, ch. xii. 1, seqq.

This probably occurred about the time of the Pentecost, the

first Pentecost in our Lord's ministry, — perhaps on the Sabbath following that day. About this time the wheat harvest was for the most part ended. Some wheat, however, might still be left standing. But I suppose it to have been gathered from the field in question, and that the disciples took only from that portion which, according to the Jewish Law (Leviticus xix. 9, xxiii. 22), was to be left for gleaners.

Supposing our Lord, then, to have left Judæa two or three weeks after the Passover, a month or more remains for all the transactions recorded by Matthew between the twelfth verse of the fourth chapter and the end of the eleventh chapter.

Here it is worth while to observe how little time was actually occupied by much that Matthew relates. From the beginning of the fifth chapter to the thirty-fourth verse of the ninth chapter, we have the transactions of only three days. All that is related in the tenth chapter could have occupied but a part of one day; and so all that is related in the eleventh, from the second verse to the end.

Going on with Matthew's Gospel, we find no coincidence between him and John in the narrative of the same events, till we come to the feeding of the five thousand. (Matthew xiv. 13, seqq.) This, as we learn from John (vi. 4), was near a Passover, the second Passover, as I suppose, in our Lord's ministry.

From this point, therefore, we must turn back to find, if we can, somewhere in Matthew's narrative, a place for our Lord's visit to Jerusalem at the time of one of the Jewish festivals, as related in the fifth chapter of John. This festival, I suppose, was the Feast of Tabernacles.

In Matthew's Gospel there is evidently a break between the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth

chapter ; and here, I conceive, the visit of our Lord to Jerusalem is to be inserted. Perhaps on his journey to Jerusalem he took Nazareth in his way. (Matthew xiii. 53 – 58 ; Mark vi. 1 – 6.)

After his visit to Nazareth, he, according to Mark vi. 7, seqq., sent away his disciples to preach by themselves. The same sending away of his disciples is mentioned by Luke in a similar connection, Luke ix. 1, seqq. ; compare verse 7, seqq. with Mark vi. 14. This, it seems to me probable, was the first time that he had sent his Apostles to preach apart from himself.

At first view it may seem from Matthew (ch. x.) that he had done so at an earlier period in his ministry. But I conceive that Matthew's account refers to the time when he first solemnly announced to his twelve disciples their office as future ministers of his religion, and enforced upon them some of the duties connected with the character which they were about to sustain. Matthew, according to his usual manner, has, I think, brought together directions given by our Lord to his disciples at different times.

That the Apostles were not simultaneously appointed to their office, as mentioned by Matthew, and sent away by our Lord on a mission to preach by themselves, appears from various considerations. In the eleventh chapter of Matthew, following that which contains the discourse addressed to them, we have another long discourse of our Lord, which we cannot reasonably suppose to have been preserved except in the memory and by the report of Apostles ; and in the next chapter (xii. 1, seqq.) we find clear evidence that his Apostles were with him.

After our Lord's visit to Nazareth, therefore, I suppose he dismissed the greater part, nearly all, of "his disciples" or

Apostles, giving them a commission to preach in his name. It might be neither convenient for him nor for them that they should in a body accompany him at this time to Jerusalem. John, however, went with him, as we may conclude from the account which he has given of the events which there took place, and of the discourses there delivered by our Lord. The Apostles, it would appear from Mark vi. 30 and Luke ix. 10, did not generally rejoin him till a little before the Passover. His ministry and theirs were naturally suspended by the cold and rainy season which soon followed the Feast of Tabernacles; and from this circumstance, and from the fact that they were not generally with him, we have no further account of our Lord's ministry through the winter.

After the second Passover in his ministry, he remained in Galilee till the succeeding Feast of Tabernacles mentioned by John (ch. vii. 1, seqq.). He then, as I conceive, left it for the last time, when, as John relates (ch. vii. 10), he went up to the festival. This final departure of our Lord from Galilee is, I suppose, the same with that mentioned by Matthew (ch. xix. 1) and Mark (ch. x. 1), and what Luke had in mind when he wrote the fifty-first verse of the ninth chapter of his Gospel.

According to Matthew and Mark (as cited above), he passed from Galilee into Peræa. This I think Matthew indicates as the country where he principally remained during the latter part of his ministry; and the supposition is confirmed by what is said by John (ch. x. 40).

The only account given by Matthew of what our Lord did and said between his final departure from Galilee and his last visit to Jerusalem, is contained in the nineteenth and twentieth chapters of his Gospel. To this nothing is added by Mark. Some of the relations peculiar to Luke may belong

to this period. In John (vii. 11 – xii. 11) we have an account of various transactions and discourses which occurred in this interval.

Proceeding, therefore, on the supposition that, of the four Evangelists, Matthew and John alone have preserved the chronological order of events, it will be perceived that the proposed method of harmonizing them, or rather of arranging in sequence the events which they record, is very simple, and requires no change in the order of either. Where Mark and Luke relate the same events with Matthew, the place of those events in the narrative is to be determined by that assigned them by Matthew ; where they relate different events, we have no means of determining how they should be arranged, except from their connection with events the place of which has been ascertained.

See, further, the note on Luke ix. 51 – xviii. 14.

NOTE C.*

(See pp. 24, 349.)

ON THE CHANGE OF CHARACTER IN MEN SPOKEN OF IN
THE NEW TESTAMENT AS PRODUCED BY CHRISTIANITY.

“WHEN we compare the common character and expectations of the Jews with the circumstances in which Jesus Christ appeared, the requisitions and spirit of his religion, and the prospect which he opened to his followers, it will appear that a moral and intellectual change the most extraordinary was necessary for a Jew to become a Christian. He was to relinquish his hope of a conquering and triumphant Messiah, and to take for his master a poor man of humble origin, whose claims were rejected with scorn and hatred by the interpreters of the Law and the rulers of the people. He had expected a leader who would confer upon his followers power, wealth, and splendor. In becoming a follower of Jesus Christ, he was to join himself to one who had not where to lay his head; whose invitation was, ‘Let him who would be my follower renounce himself, and come after me, bearing his cross,’—that is, Let him follow me as on the way to crucifixion,—and whose promises were, ‘You will be hated by all men for my sake.’ ‘He who kills you will think that he is offering a sacrifice to God.’ The Jews had been expecting a dispensation by which God, delivering them from their oppressors, would bestow new and magnifi-

* [This note consists of portions of a discourse which was first published in “The Liberal Preacher” for October, 1827.]

cent distinctions upon them, his chosen people. He who claimed to be their Messiah had come to announce to them the displeasure of God, to call them to reformation, and to treat as vile and hypocritical those whom they held in the highest honor. The blessings which he brought were to be offered as well to the Gentiles as to themselves. Instead of being the deliverer of his people, he proclaimed that their habitation was to be left by them desolate. The hope of Israel had come to denounce punishment and destruction. There was an utter discordance between the character of the new dispensation and everything which they had expected. If a Jew who felt strongly the passions and hopes common to his countrymen could have been made to comprehend at once its character, objects, and effects, in relation to the Jewish people, we can hardly conceive what must have been the revolt of his feelings, — his amazement, and horror.

“ But to this dispensation the Jew who became a disciple of our Saviour was to be gradually reconciled. Nor was this all. He was not merely to relinquish those expectations which had been handed down, as the most precious inheritance, from father to son, and which had been his solace and his pride; to eradicate his national and religious prejudices and antipathies; to recognize the justice of the punishment and destruction of his people; to close his eyes upon all those views of personal aggrandizement with which he might have become a follower of Jesus Christ, and to prepare himself for self-denial, a life of suffering, and a violent death; — he was, at the same time, to acquire a new moral and religious character. The religion of the Jews in the time of Christ was generally a matter of pride and ostentation, of ritual ceremonies and superstitious observances. It exhibited that worst form of false religion, which

grows up with men's vices, receiving strength from them, and imparting strength in return. But the mind of the Jew who became a convert to Christ was to be pervaded by a new spirit. He had gloried in his knowledge of God, and in what he believed his peculiar relation to him, but he was now to form much nobler and more correct conceptions of his character; he was to feel towards him much purer devotion and much stronger love; and this, at the very time that he was learning to regard him no longer as the peculiar God of the descendants of Abraham, but as about to cast them off from his favor to be trodden under foot by the Gentiles. His passions had been engrossed by the objects of this world; and he had possessed only some indistinct and erroneous belief respecting the future life, which had operated but little on his heart or conduct. He was now to acquire a new principle, which should supersede or control every other,—the principle of faith, the habitual consideration of the invisible and the remote. Under its influence he was called upon to triumph over the dread of suffering and of death, and to regard everything here as unworthy to be compared with that great reward in heaven, of which the promises of his Master alone gave him assurance. He was called to the habitual practice of a virtue he had never dreamed of, one of which ancient Philosophy in her best days had formed but imperfect conceptions, the virtue of Christian charity. He was to become a follower of that Master who came 'not to be served, but to serve'; he was no longer to consider how much good he could possess himself of, but how much good he could communicate; he was no longer to regard himself as an insulated individual, who might pursue his distinct interests with no other care than not to encroach upon the rights of others; he was now to view his interests as blended with the interests of all

around him. He was not merely to forget that pride and those resentments which had formed a barrier between him and the rest of mankind; he was to be ready, if summoned to that high office, to go forth, as a minister of the religion which he professed, to urge the acceptance of its blessings upon all men, idolaters, sinners, and Gentiles; to serve the injurious, to conciliate the insulting, and to recognize in an enemy and a persecutor only an erring fellow-creature, capable of being reformed and benefited.

“I do not suppose that the Christian character was completely attained by all, or by a great majority, of the converts to our religion. But the character which I have described was proposed for attainment by Jesus Christ, however imperfectly his requisitions might be sometimes understood, or however imperfectly they might be complied with. In every sincere convert to his religion, a great change necessarily took place; and by some, we believe by Apostles and by martyrs, a degree of religious and moral excellence was attained, which has justly rendered them in all succeeding times objects of admiration and reverence.

“The change required in the Gentiles in order to their becoming Christians was certainly not less than that demanded of Jews. A few individuals of a nation separated from the rest of the world and regarded with dislike and scorn, individuals rude in speech, expressing themselves in language which seemed barbarous to those whom they addressed, and with conceptions to which they were wholly unaccustomed, came among them to speak of a Jewish Messiah, of God, of man’s nature and responsibility, and of immortal life. They came to give true notions of the Divinity to idolaters, to communicate religion in all its spirituality to those whose nominal religion was an affair of this

world, rather affording occasions for licentious indulgence, than operating as any restraint upon the passions and appetites. They came to discourse of sin and righteousness to men ignorant of the meaning of such terms, in the sense in which they are used by a Christian. They came to teach mere creatures of this life to feel and act as heirs of eternity. Their converts were separated from their former pursuits, pleasures, and companions, to form a new class of men, whose striking peculiarities were continually exposing them to remark and insult. Heathens, to whom this world had been all, were to be detached from it, to look upon it as passing away, ‘to rejoice as though they rejoiced not,’ and ‘to weep as though they wept not.’

“When we bring together the conceptions which we derive from heathen authors of the character, the manner of life, the prevailing sentiments, the modes of thinking, the motives, the passions, and the vices, of the heathen inhabitants of Rome or of Corinth, and then turn to the New Testament, and form a just notion of the character which was required in a Christian, we perceive that human nature is presented under two aspects, which may, at first view, appear to have almost nothing in common. . . . The change of character which was actually effected, first in the Jewish, and afterwards in the Gentile converts, is beyond comparison the most extraordinary moral phenomenon in the history of mankind. When we have formed a just conception of it, we shall not wonder for a moment at the metaphors by which it was described, as a change from darkness into marvellous light, as a new birth, as a resurrection from the dead, and as a new creation.

“BUT, in explaining the language of Scripture which implies that a great revolution was taking place in the moral world,

we are to consider not merely the change required and produced by Christianity in those individuals who were its first converts ; we are to consider also the great change which this new dispensation of God was to effect in the condition of mankind. The period which the Jews had denominated ‘the coming age,’ denoting by that phrase the reign of their Messiah, had arrived. The kingdom of Heaven, which had been so long before the subject of prophecy, and which had been so long waited for, was about to be established. It was indeed a dispensation of a very different kind from that which the Jews had expected, and one of a far higher character. The appointed time was fulfilled, and the God of the universe was revealing his will and purposes to his creatures of this world. Moral and intellectual darkness covered the earth ; and God said, Let there be light, and there was light. He was calling men to reformation and virtue ; he was teaching them his own character, and their immortal destiny, disclosing new hopes the most joyful, and presenting new motives the most powerful, and opening new sources of human improvement. The laws of nature were suspended in their course to bear testimony to the truth of his minister ; and, amid the most splendid attestations to its divine authority, a religion was introduced, which, impeded and counteracted as its effects have been by the vices and follies of its professed disciples, has yet exerted a vast influence to change for the better the condition of man, to ennoble the human character, to give the ascendancy to what is moral and intellectual in our nature, to establish and give efficacy to correct notions of social duty, to connect men together by sympathies before unknown, and, above all, to teach them to regard themselves, not as creatures all whose interests are bounded by the hopes and fears of this life, but as immortal

beings; — a religion which gave to all by whom it was received, excepting the Jews, a knowledge of God, and which unites all its faithful disciples to him by affections that, in the heathen world at least, had scarcely been felt before its introduction. It was with reference to the effects that Christianity is adapted to produce, which it was producing, and which it was foreseen that it would produce, that its establishment is spoken of as *the regeneration*. ‘In the regeneration,’ says our Saviour, ‘when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory.’ ‘Old things have passed away,’ says St. Paul, ‘behold, all things have become new.’ The kingdom of God, of Heaven, of Christ, was establishing. It was by these metaphors that the new dispensation was denoted. And in correspondence with them, and in conformity to the boldness of Oriental and prophetic imagery, Christ represents himself as just about to assume his kingdom with the glorious power of the Father, accompanied by the angels, to execute the laws which he had given. ‘There are some,’ he says, ‘standing here who will not taste of death, before they see the Son of Man coming as a king.’ To enter the kingdom of Heaven was to acknowledge the divine authority of Christ, to submit to his laws, in the hope of those glorious rewards which he made known, and thus to enjoy the blessings which he came to confer.

“WE have seen what character was required to enter this kingdom. Christ came to call sinners to reformation. It was reformation which was preached by his forerunner, the Baptist. In the days of Herod ‘appeared John the Baptist, preaching in the Desert of Judæa, and saying, Reform ; for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand.’ ‘*Reform*,’ — it is thus that the word in the original ought to be rendered, and not ‘*Repent*,’ as it is in

th- Common Version. The primary idea expressed by *repentance* is merely sorrow for one's past conduct ; the primary idea expressed by *reformation* is a change from a bad moral state to a good one. It was the necessity of the latter, and not of the former, except so far as the former is connected with the latter, that John meant to inculcate. The substitution of the words *repent* and *repentance* throughout the Common Version of the New Testament, instead of the proper expressions, *reform* and *reformation*, has had a tendency to produce and confirm false notions respecting the requisitions of religion. It has led men to believe that there is an efficacy in mere sorrow for past sins, which we are, in fact, nowhere taught by Christianity that it has ; and to connect with it an expectation of all the consequences which belong only to sincere and thorough reformation. Thorough reformation, when any considerable part of life has been misspent, must commonly be the labor of years ; but men have been weak enough to fancy that all its benefits might be enjoyed by the exercise of a certain degree of sorrow during a few hours or a few days, and those too, perhaps, among the last of an immoral and irreligious life. Mere sorrow for past sins is of no value or importance, except so far as it may tend to prevent their repetition, or in some other way conduce to reformation. It is true that theologians will tell us, that in their idea of repentance is included a change of affections and conduct, and that they understand this change to be expressed by the word when used in our Common Version of the New Testament. But the idea of this change, as I have before said, is not included in the primary meaning of the word, nor is it brought distinctly to the minds of the generality of readers by its use. Even in most theological systems, partly from the use of this word, and partly from other causes, sorrow for past

sins has been elevated to a rank to which it is not entitled ; and too little has been said about the necessity of reformation in connection with it.

“ Indeed, a great deal too much efficacy may be attributed to reformation as well as to repentance. There is a very wide difference between the sins of men who are in such a state as those to whom our Saviour and his Apostles preached, — the sins of men who have been educated in very imperfect and very erroneous notions both of religion and morality, and who are surrounded by examples of depravity, — and the sins of those who enjoy or who may enjoy the knowledge and the privileges of Christians. ‘I obtained mercy,’ says St. Paul, ‘because I acted ignorantly, in unbelief.’ ‘The times of past ignorance,’ he tells the Athenians, ‘God overlooked’; and we find other language, both of our Saviour and of his Apostles, to the same effect. There are few truths of more importance to be early impressed upon the mind, than that many of the consequences of our conduct are irretrievable ; that if we have chosen ill, we must not indeed abide by our choice, but we must suffer its effects, and that we may cause much evil to ourselves and others, which no future tears will wash away, and no future exertions will remedy.

“ OUR Saviour, like his forerunner, commenced with the preaching of reformation. ‘From that time Jesus began to preach, saying, Reform ; for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand.’ In his Sermon on the Mount, the change of moral character required by the new dispensation was clearly exhibited in the contrast which he made through a considerable part of this discourse between the precepts given by him and the rules of morality to which his hearers had been accustomed.

between the words that he said to them, and the words that they had heard as having been ‘said to them of old time.’ Other portions of this discourse afford a contrast less obviously brought out, but in itself not less striking, between the exhortations and commands of our Saviour and the opinions, dispositions, and purposes of those whom he addressed.

“ We will pass to our Saviour’s remarkable conversation with Nicodemus, which occurred at Jerusalem, at the first Passover which he attended after the commencement of his ministry. Nicodemus undoubtedly came to our Saviour possessed with the Jewish notions respecting the Messiah. That Jesus was the Messiah, he could hardly have felt assured. He was wavering, probably, between the impression made by his miracles, which inclined him to believe that he was, and the doubts excited by his origin, by the circumstances of his life, and by his not openly assuming the character. He appears fully to have believed that he was a teacher from God. His objects in visiting our Saviour, — beside a natural curiosity to listen to his private declarations, if he were nothing more than a divine teacher, — probably were to ascertain the extent of his claims, and to propitiate his favor, if he were indeed the long-expected deliverer and king; so that he might be thus early numbered among his friends, and obtain a large share in those honors and rewards which Nicodemus believed him, if in truth he were the Messiah, about to dispense. He came to him however by night, not willing to expose himself to the obloquy and hazard of openly professing respect for one in whom no other of the rulers or Pharisees believed. Manifesting, however, these fears, coming to our Saviour with the purposes which he probably had, and holding the common notions and possessed with the common feelings of the Jews, he was in a very different

state of mind from that which Jesus required in his disciples. The design, therefore, of the first part of our Saviour's conversation with him, as recorded by St. John, was to announce the necessity of that renovation of character, the nature of which I have endeavored to explain.

.

“ Our Saviour says to Nicodemus, ‘ Unless one be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.’ The general meaning of these words is explained by what has been already remarked ; but there is further, I conceive, a particular allusion in them to a prejudice which strongly possessed the minds of the Jews. They believed that by birth, as natural descendants of Abraham, they were entitled to the favor of God and the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom. They regarded themselves, and the proselytes to their religion, who as such became incorporated with their nation, as the exclusive objects of the promises made to Abraham. It was in opposition to this error, that John the Baptist, in announcing the kingdom of Heaven and calling them to reformation, warned them not to say in their hearts, ‘ We are Abraham's children,’ as if this afforded a security that they would receive new favors from God upon the coming of the Messiah. It was in reference likewise to the same prejudice, that the Evangelist John, in the commencement of his Gospel, in a passage which illustrates the words of our Saviour, speaks of the followers of Christ as being ‘ born not of any particular race, nor through the will of the flesh, nor through the will of man, but being children of God.’ Our Saviour teaches Nicodemus that no one would enjoy the blessings of the kingdom of Heaven in consequence of his being born a Jew ; but, on the contrary, that the Jew must be born again : that a change was required in him which this metaphor well described.

“ Nicodemus, it is probable, had some imperfect conception of the meaning of our Saviour ; but his mind revolted from it. He could not bring himself to believe that a Jew must undergo an entire change, and that he must become the disciple of a new religion, in order to partake of the benefits of that dispensation which the Jews had expected as the last and most distinguished manifestation of God’s favor to his chosen people. Rejecting, therefore, at once this sense of the words, Nicodemus recurs to their literal signification ; and the import of his following question seems to have been this : Your words cannot mean what they seem to imply, — what then is their meaning ?

How can a man be born when he is old ? Can he enter his mother’s womb again, and be born ?’ He states the absurdity of the literal meaning, to lead our Saviour to explain himself further. ‘ Jesus answered, Truly, truly I tell thee, unless one be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.’ To be born of water was to be baptized as a proselyte to the new religion ; and by this act to make public profession of being its disciple. He who did this was said to be *born of water*, because baptism was the outward sign of the commencement of his new life. By being *born of the Spirit* is meant having a new character formed through those good influences upon the mind, direct and indirect, of which God is the source. In the style of Scripture, all good moral influences are referred to the Spirit of God. This Spirit, the invisible energy by which God is drawing men to goodness, is around us as well as within us. It does not merely operate upon the mind in directly imparting light and strength ; its power is to be felt in the works and providence of God, in our natural sentiments of right and wrong, in the events of life, and in all the truths which revelation makes known to us. It is to be acknowledged

in whatever enlarges our conceptions of duty, raises our affections, gives us strength to resist temptation, or animates us in any good purpose. In the passage before us, our Saviour, I conceive, had particular reference to the truths and motives of Christianity, as the means which God was employing to effect the moral renovation of men ; and to those direct influences upon the mind which, as we believe, accompanied the reception of the Christian faith.

“ He proceeds to say, ‘ What is born of the flesh is flesh ; and what is born of the Spirit is spirit.’ The flesh is perishable and mortal ; it was regarded as vile, and considered by the Jews, in common with many ancient philosophers, as the source of moral corruption. What is spiritual, on the contrary, was regarded by them as excellent, pure, having in itself power and life. The meaning of our Saviour, therefore, was, that men, considered as destitute of those spiritual influences of which he had spoken, regarded merely as beings born into this world, were to be viewed as low in character, perishable, and sinful. Whether born as Jews or not, they could not be subjects of the kingdom of Heaven. But, on the contrary, they whose minds had been renovated by the Spirit, were pure and excellent, possessing a principle of immortal life. The former class were like the flesh ; the latter, like what is spiritual.

“ Our Saviour tells Nicodemus not to wonder at these declarations as if they were unintelligible or incredible. He then describes the manner in which the great change in men, of which he had spoken, was to be produced. He compares the operation of the Spirit to the action of the wind. This is done by an easy metaphor in the original, for the same word in Greek signifies both *spirit* and *wind*.

“ In the words referred to, the purpose of our Saviour was

to declare that the change announced by him was not to be the result of any great visible revolutions in the state of the world, such as the Jews had expected to attend the coming of the Messiah ; but that, on the contrary, it was taking place through the operation of a new influence on the minds of men, — an influence invisible as the wind, but like the wind, which ‘blows where it will,’ not to be restrained ; producing sensible effects, ‘you hear its sound’ ; and governed by such laws that its commencement and progress could not be clearly discerned, ‘you know not whence it comes or whither it is going.’ The meaning of this passage is nearly the same with that of the answer given by Christ to the Pharisees, who asked him when the kingdom of God was to come. He said, ‘The kingdom of God is not coming with any show that may be watched for ; nor will men say, Lo ! it is here ; or, Lo ! it is there ; for lo ! the kingdom of God is within you.’ ”

• • • • •

NOTE D.*

(See pp. 63, 121, 127, 265, 379.)

ON THE WANT OF VERBAL EXACTNESS IN THE REPORTS OF OUR SAVIOUR'S LANGUAGE BY THE EVANGELISTS; AND ON SOME OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF HIS MODE OF TEACHING.

“The general spirit and meaning of our Saviour's teaching, as recorded in the Gospels, is free from all uncertainty. If we receive it as the teaching of a divine messenger, it leaves no doubt concerning the fundamental truths of religion, — the being of God, God's care for men, and man's immortality and moral responsibility. But in the words ascribed to him we sometimes meet with difficulties, not affecting the clearness with which those truths were taught, but preventing us from readily or certainly ascertaining the precise purport and bearing of what he said in relation to topics incidentally presented.

“Among the various causes by which this uncertainty is produced, there is one perfectly obvious and indisputable, though it has been less regarded, perhaps, than any other. It is, that his words are not always given with verbal accuracy by the different historians of his ministry. We need not recur to any reasoning to show that this fact is in the highest degree probable. The cases in which the Evangelists unquestionably intended to report the same words of Jesus, but in which they differ from each other in their reports, render it certain. It

* [From “Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels,” Vol. II Additional Note D, Section VII. pp. cliii. — clxii.]

follows, that there must be passages, where, to determine the exact meaning that was expressed by our Saviour, we cannot take the precise words of some one of the Evangelists as an infallible guide. When we meet with a difficulty that cannot otherwise be fully solved, the consideration that the reporter may have varied the expression used by Jesus should enter into our explanation.

“ Now such unintentional errors, more or less affecting the sense, were most likely to occur on subjects concerning which strong prejudices existed among the Jews, that had moulded their forms of language, if they were prejudices that Jesus did not directly oppose. Every one easily slides into the language of a popular error, or rather we may find it difficult to avoid such language, when not expressly contending against the error. But on the supposition that the Evangelists had not decidedly renounced the opinions of their countrymen respecting the Pentateuch and the Levitical Law, we cannot doubt that they might unconsciously attribute to Jesus incidental expressions favoring those opinions ; — that they might have done so in cases where, if his precise words had been compared with their report of them, they would not have recognized any important difference of character or effect between his language and their own.

“ The unquestionable fact, that the words of our Saviour are not always reported with perfect correctness, is to be kept in view in studying the history of his ministry. It may not lead us to reject any declaration ascribed to him, as not founded on what he actually said, or as not, in its *essential* meaning, true ; but it may enter as one element into our explanation of certain passages. It is sometimes evident that it must enter into our explanation ; for it sometimes appears, from a comparison of

the Evangelists with one another, that the report of our Saviour's language which we find in one of them is defective, or otherwise incorrect, and therefore that this report must be explained with reference to the fact that it is so.

“THE general principle of explanation just stated deserves consideration, doubtless, in relation to some of the words ascribed to Jesus, that have been thought to express or imply his opinions concerning the origin of the Pentateuch and the Levitical Law. It may, as I have said, enter as one element into their explanation. But we may question how far it is necessary to resort to it, considering that another fact is to be attended to. This is, that our Saviour, on some subjects, and on some occasions, adopted the common language of the Jews, founded on their erroneous conceptions, certainly without any design of sanctioning those conceptions. — He sometimes did so for the purpose of changing the meaning of the terms by giving them a new application. Thus, the Jews, under the name of ‘the kingdom of Heaven,’ expected an earthly kingdom, of which the Messiah was to be the monarch. The idea of such a kingdom alone was excited in their minds, when Jesus announced that the kingdom of Heaven was at hand. But he used the term figuratively, in a very different sense, which was to be gradually explained by subsequent events. — Sometimes he used such language for the purpose of rhetorical illustration, which may be drawn either from fact or fable. ‘When a foul spirit,’ he said, ‘has gone out of a man, it passes through deserts in search of a resting-place, and finds it not.’* No intelligent reader will suppose from these words, that our Saviour

* Matthew xii. 43.

meant to adopt and sanction the then common notion, that desert places were frequented by dæmons. — At other times he is reasoning upon the false conceptions of those whom he addresses, — reasoning *ad hominem*, as it is called. ‘If I cast out dæmons through Beelzebub, through whom do your disciples cast them out?’* There were some of the school of the Pharisees, it appears, who pretended to cast out dæmons by exorcism, and who, when they succeeded in producing a real or seeming return to sanity in their patients, were thought to have effected a great work. Our Saviour did not mean to imply that these men possessed powers like his own. The object of his question merely was to expose the prejudices and gross injustice of the Pharisees, who believed that their disciples had, in the one particular in question, similar power to that of Christ, and who, in his case and theirs, regarded its exercise so differently. In such reasoning from false conceptions, the language of error is necessarily used. The character of such reasoning may be more or less obvious; and when not perfectly obvious, he who does not exercise his understanding, but looks only at the naked words before him, may insist that a speaker or writer means to affirm an error, which, in fact, he introduces into his discourse only to show its inconsistency with some other error, or as a temporary stepping-stone on the way to truth. — And, besides the occasions that have been mentioned, language founded on the mistaken conceptions of the Jews was employed by our Saviour, either for the sake of producing an effect on the imagination and feelings of his hearers, which could not have been produced, or could not have been produced so powerfully, in any other way, or of conveying

* Matthew xii. 27.

some truth to their understandings, which they could not have distinctly apprehended if expressed in any other form. Thus he spoke, for example, of moral evil, under the terrific personification of Satan. In such cases we must, and we may easily, distinguish his essential meaning from the modes of expression in which it is clothed, — modes of expression adapted to Jewish conceptions, but not correspondent to our own. Some of the truths taught by Jesus could not but receive an accidental coloring from the medium of the language through which they were conveyed, and we must not confound this accidental coloring with their essential nature.* But this subject admits some further explanation.

“EVERY language is conformed to the conceptions of those who use it, and consists wholly of the signs or expressions of their conceptions. The progress of knowledge makes necessary the enlargement of a language. The discoveries of modern chemistry, for example, have required a new vocabulary, in

“* The principle involved in the preceding remarks, that in explaining the words of our Lord we should consider to whom they were immediately addressed, is equally implied in the following passage from Tertullian, — a very remarkable one, considering the time when it was written, — though he makes a different application of it: ‘*Omnia quidem dicta Domini omnibus posita sunt; per aures Judæorum ad nos transierunt; sed pleraque in personas directa, non proprietatem admonitionis nobis constituerunt, sed exemplum.*’ — ‘All the sayings of our Lord are meant for all; they have passed to us through the ears of the Jews; but many of them, being addressed to individuals, are not, for us, literal precepts, but exemplifications of duty.’ De Præscript. Hæretic. c. 8. p. 205 Conf. De Fugâ in Persecutione, c. 13. pp 542, 543.”

which they may be preserved and communicated. When, on any subject of wide extent, the conceptions of the generality of men are erroneous, their errors enter into the structure of their speech; they are embodied in the words which they use. It is often necessary for him who would correct such errors to introduce new terms, or to give new senses or a new application to terms already in use. When circumstances do not require, or admit, that those errors should be controverted, the language in which they are incorporated may be used by one fully acquainted with the truth. It may often be employed with propriety and advantage. There are occasions when, by its use, right conceptions and feelings may be produced, which could not be communicated by language more correct. I understand (for it is a subject on which I am incapable of forming an independent opinion), that, at the present day, many of those qualified to judge reject the theory of the emission of rays from luminous bodies, and regard the sensation of light as produced by the undulations of a luminous ether, as that of sound is caused by undulations of the air. Supposing this theory to be true, and that it should be universally received, the language which has been formed upon the old belief will not soon, if ever, cease to be the language of common life and of poetry. Though, upon the supposition just made, this language implies throughout what is contrary to the truth, yet it is equally well adapted to the expression of all truths that concern the generality of men, as language conformed to the correct theory. It will, at least for a long time, be better adapted to this purpose, as being more intelligible to the unlearned,—more conformed to the appearances, if not to the reality, of things. Nor can we, with our present associations, readily believe that a similar profusion of figures and imagery to that which poetry now bor-

rows from light may be effectively addressed to men's imagination and feelings through the medium of other forms of language than those to which we are accustomed. So also in Chemistry; however requisite the new nomenclature may be for the purposes of science, it is unimportant, except indirectly, as regards the arts or medicine. The old terms might, in many cases, serve equally well for the practical purposes of life. We might continue to call one substance 'the Oil of Vitriol,' and another 'the Sugar of Lead,' and, notwithstanding the erroneous ideas suggested by those names, we might talk of them as intelligently, and explain their properties and uses as correctly, as if we denominated them 'Sulphuric Acid,' and 'the Acetate of Lead'; and, in speaking to those familiar only with the former names, no one would hesitate to use them. Truth, then, may be clearly and effectually conveyed in the language of error; that is to say, in terms having their origin in erroneous conceptions, and adapted to the expression of those conceptions.

"In the time of our Saviour, the notions of the Jews on many subjects connected with his preaching were false and superstitious. These notions were necessarily ingrained in their forms of speech. A philosophical language, in which they should be avoided, might undoubtedly have been formed by him; and such a language might have been intelligible to the philosophers, if there were any philosophers, among the Jews. But our Saviour preached to the poor, he addressed multitudes, his immediate disciples were fishermen and tax-gatherers, and others of no higher intellectual attainments, and he could use only popular language,—such language as his hearers would understand and feel. He might, on a certain occasion, have said, I foresee the triumph of my religion over evil, moral and physical; but, even had he been partially understood by his

Learners, — if they had had some notion of what was meant by ‘evil, moral and physical,’ and by ‘the triumph of his religion,’ — the assertion would have passed over their minds as a shadowy abstraction, and left no impression. He did in fact say, with the same meaning, ‘I saw Satan falling from heaven like lightning’; and in so saying, he used imagery which was adapted to their conceptions and feelings. The whole phraseology of the Jews concerning the Pentateuch and the other books of the Old Testament was moulded on their erroneous opinions respecting those books. Our Saviour might have avoided the use of it, and have introduced new modes of speech, conformed to the truth. In this case, it is probable that he would have abundantly excited their attention. Such a fundamental change in their religious language would have exposed him to questioning. Pharisees would have come ‘to try him’ on the subject. What would have been the effect, if he had declined to explain himself? What would have been the consequences, if he had explained himself? In the latter case, unless God had seen fit to use other means than he did for establishing truth among men, the whole ministry of Jesus might have been wasted, and he might have died a martyr to an ineffectual attempt to correct the false opinions of his countrymen in relation to the Old Testament and the Levitical Law. What he did do, that is, what the circumstances of his ministry permitted him to do, to manifest his sense of those errors, will appear hereafter.

“ESSENTIAL truths, then, may be clearly and effectually, sometimes most effectually, conveyed in the language of error. It is true, that one writing at the present day on any subject of morals or religion, who may suppose himself to be addressing

intelligent and well-informed readers, is bound, as far as possible, to avoid such language, when it may occasion any mistake as to his meaning. It is his duty to express himself with unequivocal distinctness. But such language, in regard to many topics, constituted the popular, or rather the only, language of the Jews ; and our Saviour was placed in circumstances altogether different from those of a philosopher of our own times. That he might not distract the attention of his hearers from the great truths which it was the purpose of his mission to make known, that he might not uselessly alarm their prejudices and rouse their passions, he sometimes adopted their common language, though founded on error. We are not hence to consider him as sanctioning their errors. Such language, as used by him, is to be understood as we always understand the language of error when used by one whom we believe fully to comprehend the truth, and to have no purpose but to express it. We view it as an adaptation of his thoughts to the conceptions of those whom he addresses ; or as the presentation of ideas, essentially correct, in the only forms in which they have been embodied in language, though these forms may contain an alloy of error. In the teaching of our Saviour it is the essential meaning alone that is to be regarded. The form of expression may be an accident, resulting from temporary and local circumstances, from the character of those whom he immediately addressed, and, especially, from the nature of their conceptions and language."

NOTE E.*

(See pp. 63, 108, 135, 159, 161, 189, 196, 265, 282, 300, 302, 345, 352, 374, 380, 409, 414, 419, 427, 440, 442, 479.)

ON THE FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE IN WHICH OUR SAVIOUR SPEAKS OF HIS PERSONAL AGENCY, AND PARTICULARLY OF HIS FUTURE "COMING"; AND ON THE EXPECTATIONS OF THE APOSTLES CONCERNING HIS VISIBLE RETURN TO EARTH.

"It is a common figure in the New Testament to speak of Christ personally, when his religion, under some one of its aspects, effects, or relations, is intended; and this is sometimes done when the expression is such as our use of language does not allow. St. Paul addresses the Colossians, according to a verbal rendering, thus (ii. 6, 7): 'As, then, ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, walk in him, rooted and grounded in him.' He exhorts them (iii. 13) to forgive each other, 'as Christ had forgiven them'; not referring to any forgiveness from Christ in person, but to the forgiveness of their past sins upon their becoming sincere Christians. He says to the churches addressed in the Epistle to the Ephesians, churches to which Jesus had never preached (iv. 20, 21): 'You have not so learned Christ, since you have heard him and been taught by him as the truth is in Jesus.' He speaks to the Romans of the 'spirit of Christ,' that is, 'the spirit of Christianity,' dwelling in them; and the expression, 'that Christ may dwell in your

* [From the "Statement of Reasons," pp. 198-212, and (Appendix) pp. 299-331.]

hearts,' is elsewhere (Ephesians iii. 17) used by him. He writes to the Corinthians (1 Ep. xv. 18) of those 'who have fallen asleep in Christ,' meaning, those who have died 'being Christians'; for 'to be in Christ' is a common phrase in his Epistles for 'being a Christian.' He tells the Philippians (i. 8), 'God is my witness how earnestly I love you all *ἐν σπλάγχνοις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, words which, from the difference in our modes of expression, do not admit of a verbal translation into our language; but the meaning of which is 'with Christian tenderness.' Again he says to them (i. 21), 'For to me life is Christ, and death is gain'; that is, 'My life is devoted to the cause of Christ, to the promotion of his religion.' In the same Epistle (iii. 8) are these words: 'I have suffered the loss of **all** these things, counting them but as refuse, that I might win **Christ**'; where the expression, 'to win Christ,' means 'to secure the blessings of Christianity.' To the Galatians, he writes (iii. 27, 28), 'Whoever of you has been baptized to Christ, has put on Christ'; that is, as appears from the connection, 'is entitled to all the privileges of a Christian.' The Apostle proceeds: 'There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor freeman, neither male nor female; but you are all one in Christ Jesus,' — 'you are all on an equality as Christians.' So also the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever,' intending by those words to express the unchangeableness of Christian truth.

"I have perhaps brought together more examples than are necessary, of a common form of expression. Our Saviour himself uses language in a similar manner. By a figure of speech, he refers to himself personally the effects of his religion, the divine power exerted in its establishment, and the operation of those laws of God's moral government which it announces.

Thus he says (Matthew x. 34): ‘Think not that I came to bring peace on earth. I came not to bring peace, but a sword.’ So also in Luke (xii. 49): ‘I came to cast fire on the earth; and what would I, since it has already been kindled?’ In these passages, every one understands that our Saviour speaks of the effects of his religion, and not of anything to be accomplished by his immediate agency. In like manner, when he declares that he has come ‘to save the world,’ he refers to the power of his religion in delivering men from ignorance, error, sin, and their attendant evils. ‘For God,’ it is said, ‘did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that through him the world may be saved. He who has faith in him is not condemned; but he who has not faith is already under condemnation, for not having faith in the only Son of God. And the ground of condemnation is this, that, the light having come into the world, men preferred the darkness to the light; for their deeds were evil.’* This passage shows how men are to be saved by Christ, namely, by their own act in believing and obeying him; and is also one of those which explain what is meant by his figurative language when he speaks of judging and condemning men.

“‘I am the resurrection and the life.’† In what sense our Saviour used these sublime words may appear from what immediately follows. ‘He who has faith in me, though he die, will live; and whoever lives and has faith in me will never die.’ Christ is the resurrection and the life, because through faith in him, through a practical belief of the truths which he taught, eternal life is to be obtained. Thus he afterwards says (John xii. 49, 50): ‘For I have not spoken from myself; but

* John iii. 17 – 19.

† John xi. 25.

He who sent me, the Father himself, has given me in charge what I should enjoin, and what I should teach; and I know that WHAT HE HAS CHARGED ME WITH is eternal life'; that is, it affords the means of attaining eternal life.

"He says to the Jews, in reference to those Gentiles who would embrace his religion (John x. 16): 'I have other sheep, which are not of this fold; those too I must bring in, and they will hearken to my voice, and there will be one flock and one shepherd.' In these words he does not mean to assert his own personal agency in the conversion of the Gentiles; they were not literally to hear his voice; but they were to be converted by the preaching of his religion. There is a similar figure in the words (John xii. 32), 'And I, when I shall be raised up from the earth, shall draw all men to me.'

"In his most affecting conversation with his disciples, the evening before his crucifixion, he tells them (John xiv. 18, 19), 'I will not leave you fatherless. I am coming to you again. A little while only, and the world will see me no more; but you will see me. Inasmuch as I am blessed, you will be blessed also.' Here, as I have before had occasion to explain, our Saviour refers, not to any personal presence with his disciples, but to his presence with them in the power of his religion, his presence to their minds and hearts.

"In other instances, Jesus uses what may be technically called 'an equivalent figure,' by which I mean figurative language not intended to correspond to the real state of things, except so far as to produce an effect upon the mind equivalent to what that might produce if distinctly apprehended. Thus he tells his disciples (John xiv. 2, 3), 'There are many rooms in my Father's house. Were it not so, should I have told you that I am going there to prepare a place for you? And when

I have gone and prepared a place for you, I am coming again, and will take you to myself, that where I am, you may be also.' When Jesus thus speaks of preparing a place for his disciples, and, after preparation, returning to take them with him, he uses figurative terms which do not admit of being transformed into literal. The general effect of the language, its aggregate significance, if I may so speak, is alone to be regarded. The meaning is, Your future blessedness will be as great, and is as certain, as if it were prepared for you by me, your Master and friend, and you were assured that I should return in person to conduct you to it.

"In a similar manner we are to understand another declaration of Jesus, already noticed, which has been erroneously explained (Matthew xviii. 19, 20): 'Again, I say to you, If two of you agree on earth concerning everything which they ask, their prayers will be granted by my Father in Heaven. For where two or three come together as my disciples, there am I among them.' By this, as I have said,* our Saviour intended that the prayers of his followers for the promotion of his cause, for the guidance and aid necessary to them as his ministers, would be granted as if they were his own, as if he himself were praying with them.

"In order to explain some other passages in which our Saviour speaks figuratively of his personal agency, it is necessary to attend to a new consideration. The Jews had been accustomed to designate the dispensation which they expected from their Messiah as 'the kingdom of the Messiah,' or 'the kingdom of God,' or 'of Heaven.' This language, though the conceptions which they had attached to it were erroneous, was

* See Statement of Reasons, p. 159.

such as, taken in a figurative sense, might well describe the Christian dispensation. It was adopted, therefore, by our Saviour, and after him by his Apostles; and to this leading metaphor of a kingdom much of the figurative language throughout the New Testament is conformed. The establishment of Christianity in the world is spoken of by Christ as the establishment of the kingdom or reign of the Messiah, or of God. This event he describes, figuratively, as ‘his coming to reign,’ or simply as ‘his coming,’ that is, his manifestation to men in his true character.

“Thus we find the following language (Matthew xvi. 27, 28): ‘The Son of Man is coming in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then will he render to every one according to his deeds. I tell you in truth, There are some here present who will not taste of death, before they see the Son of Man entering on his reign.’ The literal meaning of these words may be thus given: The kingdom of Heaven, the Christian dispensation, will be established by a glorious display of the power of God; and, being established, men will be rewarded or punished as their actions conform to its laws; every one will be judged by the laws of its king, the Son of Man; and the establishment of Christianity in the world will be made secure and evident during the lifetime of some of those now present.

“He is coming ‘with his angels.’ Angels were conceived of by the Jews as ministers of God’s providence; and Christ, conforming his language to their conceptions, repeatedly speaks of the ministry of angels, figuratively, to denote some manifestation of the power of God. Thus he tells Nathanael (John i. 52), ‘Ye will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending to the Son of Man’; meaning, Ye will wit-

ness manifest proof of the relation existing between God and me, his minister. When our Saviour speaks of his coming in the glory of God, with his angels, he does not mean by these figures to express, that he himself will appear in person with some visible and splendid display ; his meaning is as has been explained ; corresponding to what he elsewhere says (Luke xvii. 20, 21), ‘The kingdom of God is not coming with any show that may be watched for ; nor will men say, Lo ! it is here ; or, Lo ! it is there ; for lo ! the kingdom of God is within you.’

“ IN relation to this subject, there are still other facts to be attended to. With the establishment of Christianity was connected the punishment of the Jews for their rejection of Christ. They, in return, were rejected by God. The peculiar relation which they had held toward him was publicly abrogated. As a nation they ceased to exist. Their country was ravaged, they were destroyed, or forced from it into slavery or exile ; Jerusalem was laid waste, and the temple burnt and thrown down. How the establishment of Christianity was connected with these events, we shall perceive, if we consider that the Jews had been separated by God from other nations, to be the subjects of a special dispensation, by which he was made known to them and they were called to worship him. They were, in an obvious sense of the words, his chosen people. But, in rejecting Christ and refusing to obey him, they had virtually renounced their allegiance to God. They had dissolved by their own act the connection that had existed between Him and them. They had, if one may so speak, put the question at issue whether they were still in favor with God, still his peculiar people, and Christ were a blasphemous impostor speaking

falsely in the name of God, as they had declared him to be; or whether Christ spoke with divine authority, and they consequently had refused to submit to the authority of God. The peculiar relation that had existed between God and them was recognized by Christ himself; to them he was immediately sent; his claims were in the first instance submitted to them; and they had rejected him as a false Messiah. The question thus at issue must, it would seem, receive a public and solemn decision, before the evidence of Christianity could be considered as complete; and this decision was made by God in the rejection and punishment of the nation.

“This punishment, it is further to be recollected, had been announced by Christ. He had thus suspended the completion of the full evidence of his divine mission till the accomplishment of his prophecy. When that took place the series of proofs might be considered as closed, and his religion as established.

“Nor is this all. The Jews were the bitter enemies of Christianity; and it was against persecution from them alone, that the religion had first to struggle. In their opposition to it they had a vantage-ground which none of its subsequent enemies possessed. They claimed to know the character and purposes of God, and to be the proper judges of a prophet pretending to be sent from him to their nation. In the view of many Gentiles, the question at issue between the Jews and Christ was, without doubt, regarded as ‘a question of their own superstition,’* which it was for them to decide. Now from this opposition and persecution, of a nature to be so injurious to the growth of the new religion, Christianity was relieved by the

* Acts xxv. 19; compare xviii. 15.

destruction of the nation. It no longer appeared as an offshoot from Judaism, but assumed its independent character, not deriving support from the preceding dispensation, but throwing back evidence upon it.

“ Thus it appears in what manner the establishment of Christianity was connected with the destruction of the Jewish nation ; and why our Saviour sometimes speaks of the events as simultaneous. This is the case throughout the prophecy in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, so far as it relates to the calamities coming upon the Jews. In this there are some passages that strikingly illustrate the modes of expression elsewhere used by Christ. He evidently speaks of his own coming and presence, figuratively, in the Oriental language of poetry and prophecy ; and, in the same use of language, refers to his own personal agency events which were not to be effected by it, but were to be accomplished in his cause by God.

“ After warning his disciples against being deceived by those who would falsely claim the character of the Messiah, (his character, I conceive, as a deliverer from the tyranny of the Romans,) he says : ‘ Should they say to you, Lo ! he [the Messiah] is in some solitary place ; go not forth : Lo ! he is in some private chamber ; believe it not. For the coming of the Son of Man will be like the lightning which flashes from the east to the west,’ * — as apparent and splendid. The meaning is, For the evidence which God will afford for the establishment of my religion will be the most conspicuous and unequivocal.

“ In what immediately follows, after predicting the extinction of the Jewish nation in language of which we have abundant examples in the Hebrew prophets, that is, in the strongest

* Matthew xxiv. 26, 27.

figures representing a day of utter darkness,* he proceeds: 'And then THE SIGN of the Son of Man will appear in heaven; and then all the tribes of the land will beat their breasts, when they shall see the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.' The Jews had repeatedly demanded of Christ a sign from heaven; that is, a miracle conspicuous in the heavens, or apparently having its origin there. This, for some reason or other, they pretended to regard as what might afford clear proof of his being the Messiah, such proof as his other works did not furnish. They made the refusal of this sign one main pretext of their unbelief. 'The Jews,' says St. Paul, 'demand signs.' † In St. John's Gospel

"* 'A day of darkness' is an obvious figure for 'a day of distress.' Hence, in the Oriental style, a time of utter calamity, the destruction of a nation, is described by the extinction of the sun and the other lights of heaven. Thus Isaiah (ch. xiii. 9, 10), in speaking of the destruction of Babylon, says:—

" 'Behold, the day of Jehovah is coming, cruel with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate and to destroy its sinners out of it.

" 'For the stars of heaven and its constellations shall not give their light, the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine.'

" So also Ezekiel, describing the fall of Egypt (ch. xxxii. 7, 8):—

" 'And when I shall put thee out, I will cover the heaven, and make its stars dark. I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light; all the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over thee, and spread darkness over thy land.'

" It is unnecessary to quote at length more examples of this figurative language. Others may be found, Isaiah xxxiv. 4; Jeremiah xv 9; Joel ii. 30, 31; iii. 15; Amos viii. 9."

† 1 Corinthians i. 22.

the Jews are represented as comparing Christ with Moses, and asking, ‘What sign do you show us, that we may give you credit? What do you perform? Our fathers ate the manna in the desert; as it is written, *He gave them bread FROM HEAVEN to eat.*’ * It is in reference, I think, to this demand of the Jews, that our Saviour says, ‘Then THE SIGN of the Son of Man will appear in heaven’; intending by these words, that the most conspicuous proof would then be given of his divine mission. This proof, he expresses in what follows, would be a display of God’s providence in the establishment of his religion, which would cause all the inhabitants of the land to lament. It would be his triumph and their desolation. He describes it under the figure of his coming on the clouds of heaven with great power and glory.

“This is one of those passages which may teach us how such figurative language is to be understood. There was no visible appearance of our Saviour at the destruction of Jerusalem, nor have we reason to ascribe the punishment of the Jews in any degree to his personal agency. No such visible appearance took place before the generation then living had passed away. Yet all the events which it was his purpose to predict occurred during that period. After what has been quoted, he says (verse 34): ‘I tell you in truth, that they will all take place before this generation passes away.’ It is, then, the power of God displayed in his cause, which he speaks of figuratively as his own. Thus, likewise, we are to understand his words when he says, in his last charge to his disciples (Matthew xxviii. 18), ‘All power is given me in heaven and on earth’;

* John vi. 30, 31.

where he ascribes to himself personally the power of God which would be exerted in the support of Christianity.

“After the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, our Saviour in the next chapter (Matthew xxv.) represents the kingdom of Heaven, or Christianity, as established and in operation. All are to be judged by its laws, the laws of God’s moral government. Some will be rewarded, and some punished, all according to their deeds. After his enforcing this truth in two parables, follows that most solemn and impressive description, in which he represents himself personally as the Judge of men. It contains a most important truth enveloped in a most striking figure. It is a scenical representation, adapted powerfully to affect the minds of his immediate hearers, and our own. The naked truth here taught is the most important, the most practical truth of religion,—that which concerns us the most deeply; it is, that our happiness or misery is to be determined by ourselves, by the conformity of our conduct to the will of God, which Christ has revealed. The solemn imagery in which this truth is presented is but an expansion of the figure that our Saviour had before used: ‘The Son of Man is coming in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then will he render to every one according to his deeds.’ What was predicted in these words was to take place while some who heard him were still living: ‘I tell you in truth, There are some here present who will not taste of death, before they see the Son of Man entering on his reign.’ While the generation then living continued on earth, the kingdom of Heaven was to be established, the Messiah was to assume his reign, and men were to be judged by his laws. It may be observed that the figure which connects his judging in person with his assuming his reign, would be obvious to an Oriental; the ancient custom

having been for kings to sit in person as judges. Hence both in the Old and New Testament the verb 'to judge' is not unfrequently used as equivalent to the verb 'to reign' or 'to rule.'

"BUT this language is highly figurative ; and why, it may be asked, was such language used by our Saviour, language of which the purport is liable to be misunderstood? The answer is, that, in the first place, the ESSENTIAL meaning of the words, that meaning which is of the deepest interest to all, may be readily understood. It is clearly taught, that every man will receive according to his deeds ; that our condition in the future life will be determined by our character in the present. To account for the imagery in which this truth is presented, we must look to the intellectual habits and culture of those addressed. The contemporaries and countrymen of Christ clothed their conceptions in language very different from that with which we are familiar. To them, Oriental fashions of speech were vernacular. They were to be addressed through their feelings and imagination. The great body of the Jews, unaccustomed to any exercise of the understanding, had scarcely the power of apprehending a truth presented to them as a philosophical abstraction, in its naked and literal form. An array of figures was required to command their attention. It was necessary that the doctrine taught should be incorporated, as it were, in images obvious to sight, in order to affect their minds. The ideas presented were to be conveyed in a manner adapted to their conceptions and associations, to their capacity of comprehending and feeling. A teacher, divine or human, who should have explained the truths of religion in the language of Locke or of Butler, would have found no hearers on the shores of Gennesaret or within the walls of Jerusalem. Our

Saviour, had he been addressing a small body of philosophers, would undoubtedly have expressed himself in a manner very different from that in which he spoke to the Jewish multitudes, or even to his own disciples. I say in a very different *manner*; for the essential truths of religion could not have been more distinctly made known by him.

“ But his language, it may be said, is now liable to be misunderstood by us. Certainly it is so, upon some points of minor importance, if we will not exercise our reason upon the subject; and he is in a great error who supposes that any rule can be laid down for the study of the Scriptures, which shall supersede the exercise of investigation, thought, and judgment. Except in treating of the exact sciences, the very nature of language renders impossible such a use of it as will preclude all liability to be misunderstood. The impression which it makes, the ideas which it excites, in him who hears or reads it, depend upon the previous state of his own mind. In proportion as one is prepared to apprehend a subject as it was apprehended by him who spoke or wrote, he will be more likely to receive the meaning designed. In passing from one age to another, or from one nation to another, the significance of language varies with the ever-varying conceptions of men. Our Saviour often left his words to be explained by subsequent events, or to be rightly apprehended as the minds of his hearers acquired power to accommodate themselves to the truth. During his ministry his Apostles often misunderstood him; and it was not till many years after his ascension, that they comprehended the purport of the simple direction, ‘Go and make disciples from all nations’; and then only in consequence of a new miracle.”

“THE language of our Saviour respecting his future coming was likewise, I believe, more or less misunderstood by some or all of the Apostles, during a part or the whole of their ministry. Interpreting it literally, they looked forward, with more or less confidence, to a personal and visible return of Christ to earth at no distant period. The first coming of the Messiah had been so wholly unlike what their countrymen had universally anticipated, that, when he spoke of a future coming while the existing generation was still living, they transferred to this some of the expectations which had been long entertained respecting his appearance and kingdom. It is necessary to attend to this fact in connection with the explanation which has been given of the language of Christ. The evidence of it may appear from what follows.

“In the last chapter of John’s Gospel we have the following narrative: * ‘Peter, turning round, cast his eyes on the disciple whom Jesus loved, who was in the company, — the same who at the supper was lying at the breast of Jesus, and said to him, Master, who is he that will betray you? — Peter, seeing this disciple, said to Jesus, Master, and how will it be with him? Jesus answered him, If it be my will that he remain till I come, what does it concern you? Be you my follower. Hence spread that report among the brothers, that this disciple was not to die; though Jesus did not say to him that he would not die; but, If it be my will that he remain till I come, what does it concern you?’

“It was a belief among the Jews, as we have good reason to suppose, that the lives of those saints who might be on earth when the Messiah should appear would be prolonged through

* John xxi. 20 – 23.

his reign to the termination of all things.* This expectation, it would seem from the passage quoted, was now entertained by the disciples concerning the future coming of Christ.

“One of the most cherished hopes of the Jews was, that the Messiah would restore the kingdom to Israel; that he would raise the nation to even far greater power and splendor than they believed it to have enjoyed during the days of David and Solomon. Similar expectations were entertained by the disciples of Christ till after his death. The two who journeyed with him to Emmaus after his resurrection said, ‘We were hoping that it was he who was to be the deliverer of Israel.’ † The last question which his Apostles proposed to him was, ‘Lord, wilt thou now restore the kingdom to Israel?’ The false expectation implied in these words, it is to be observed, was not corrected by our Saviour. He only answered, ‘It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which are at the disposal of the Father alone.’ ‡ The question of the Apostles shows that they had at the time no correct understanding of his prophecy concerning the destruction of the Jewish nation; and that their minds still dwelt on the ancient hopes of their countrymen.

“The later Jews have supposed, that at the coming of the Messiah the saints who are dead will be raised from their graves to partake the glories of his kingdom.§ It is probable

“* See Pocock’s *Notæ Miscellanæ* in Maimon. *Port. Mosis*. Works, I. 177, 178.”

† Luke xxiv. 21.

‡ Acts i. 6, 7.

“§ See Pocock’s dissertation, ‘In quo variorum Judæorum de resurrectione mortuorum sententiæ expenduntur,’ one of his *Notæ Miscellanæ* upon the *Porta Mosis*. Works, I. 159, seqq.”

that this is a traditionary belief, and that a similar supposition was entertained by the Jews in the time of Christ. If so, it may have served in part as a foundation for the following striking and eloquent passage, in which St. Paul expresses to the Thessalonians his expectation of the near return of our Saviour to earth.*

“ ‘I would have you understand, brothers, concerning those who have fallen asleep, that you may not sorrow like other men who have no hope. For as we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also will God, through Jesus, bring again with him those who have fallen asleep. For this we say to you, brothers, as teachers from God, that we who are living, we who are left till the coming of the Lord,† shall not anticipate those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord himself will descend from heaven, with a summons given by an archangel sounding the trump of God; and they who have died in Christ will arise first. Then we who are living, we who are left, shall be borne up with them into the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we be ever with the Lord. So then comfort one another with these words.’

“ The Thessalonians, it is evident from both of the Epistles addressed to them, were looking for the second coming of Christ as an event not distant. This expectation they would hardly have entertained so strongly as they appear to have done, had it not been countenanced by St. Paul, through whom they had

* 1 Thess. iv. 13 – 18.

“ † It is thus that the words, *ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου*, should be rendered. St. Paul speaks of those who are alive, those who are left till the coming of the Lord, in contradistinction from those who have fallen asleep.”

just been converted to Christianity. Anticipating that our Saviour was about to come in person to establish his kingdom and reward his followers, they feared, it seems, that their friends who had died might not share in the glories and blessings to be then enjoyed by those Christians who might be living. It was the purpose of the Apostle to remove this apprehension.

“But if we rightly understand the passage, the conceptions of the Apostle respecting our Lord’s future coming were erroneous. Undoubtedly it appears that they were so. But to what does the error amount? Does it affect any important doctrine of religion? What is the essential fact here expressed, concerning the circumstances of which St. Paul had fallen into a mistake, in consequence of the previous opinions of his countrymen? The essential doctrine — all that can properly be called *a truth of religion* — is this, that, whether the followers of Christ live a longer or a shorter time on earth, their future happiness is equally secure. The dead and the living are equally the care of God; and the time is coming when they will all meet together where their Master has gone before.

“That St. Paul had in view that figurative language in which our Saviour was, as I believe, supposed to have predicted his future personal coming, appears from the words immediately following those just quoted. The Apostle adopts the thoughts and expressions which the Evangelists represent Christ as having used.

“‘But concerning the times and the seasons, brothers, there is no need that I should write to you. For you yourselves know well, that the day of the Lord is coming as a thief in the night.*”

* Compare Matthew xxiv. 43, 44. ‘But this you know, that if the master of a house is aware at what hour a thief is coming, he is

For when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction will come upon them,* as the pangs of a woman with child; and they will not escape. But you, brothers, are not in darkness, that that day should come upon you as a thief. You are all children of the light, and children of the day; we are not of the night nor of darkness. Let us not sleep, then, as others, but watch and be sober.†

“With their expectations of the Messiah’s kingdom, the Jews had connected the belief of the overthrow and destruction of his enemies. A similar belief we find expressed by St. Paul in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, (written shortly after the First,) in which he encourages them with the hope that Christ was coming to deliver them from persecution by the destruction of their persecutors.

“‘We glory in you, telling the churches of God of your constancy and faithfulness in all your persecutions, and the afflictions that you endure; which afford a pledge of that just judgment of God, by which you will be declared worthy of the kingdom of God, for which you are suffering. Since it will be just for God to make them suffer in return who are afflicting you, and to give you who are afflicted rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be manifested from heaven, with the angels of his might, in flaming fire, punishing those who know not God, and those who refuse obedience to the gospel of our Lord Jesus; who will suffer the penalty of everlasting destruction, inflicted by the glorious power of the Lord him-

awake, and suffers not his house to be broken in to. So then be you always ready; for in an hour in which you do not expect him, the Son of Man will come.’”

* Compare Matthew xxiv. 37 – 39.

† Compare Matthew xxiv. 42 – 51.

self, when he shall come in that day to be glorified in his saints, and honored in all believers.*

“But the Thessalonians, it appears, had been strongly excited by the expectation of the coming of the Lord. They were regarding it as an event close at hand. St. Paul, in consequence, though he himself anticipated it as not very distant, reminds them, in order to allay the feverish state of feeling in which they seem to have been, that he had in a previous conversation with them pointed out a certain event by which it was to be preceded, and which had not yet taken place. This event I suppose to have been the rebellion of the Jews against the Romans; but it is not necessary to our present purpose to enter into a full explanation of the obscure passage to which I refer.†

“We have seen that St. Paul, at the time when he wrote his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, was looking forward to a resurrection of those Christians who had died, which should take place at the coming of Christ; and that he regarded himself and those whom he addressed as individuals who might be living at the time of that event. The same anticipations appear in his First Epistle to the Corinthians. He says:—

“‘Through the Messiah all will be made alive. But each in his proper order; Christ the first fruits; next, they who are Christ’s, at his coming.

.

“‘Brothers, I tell you a new truth. We shall not indeed all sleep, but we shall all be changed; in a moment, in the glance of an eye, at the last trump;—for the trump will sound, and the dead will be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed’‡

* 2 Thess i. 4 – 10. † 2 Thess. ch. ii. ‡ Ch. xv. 28, 24, 51, 52

“St. Paul elsewhere in his Epistles refers, I think, to the expected personal appearance of his Master; as, when addressing the Corinthians, some of whom were disposed to an unfriendly judgment concerning him, he says: ‘Judge nothing before the time, till the Lord come, who will bring to light what is hidden in darkness, and make manifest the purposes of men’s hearts; and then every one’s praise will be from God.’ *

“Thus also he exhorts the Romans to obey the precepts he had given them, ‘understanding the time; for the hour,’ he says, ‘has come for us to awake from sleep; for now is our deliverance nearer than when we became believers. The night is far spent, the day is at hand.’ †

“To the Philippians (iv. 5) he says, ‘The Lord is at hand,’ apparently in the same sense in which in the Epistle of James (v. 8) it is said, ‘The coming of the Lord is at hand.’

“He tells the Corinthians: ‘I ever thank my God for you, on account of the favor of God bestowed upon you through Christ Jesus; for you have been enriched by him with all instruction and all knowledge, the doctrine of Christ having been firmly established among you, so that you are poor in no blessing, whilst waiting for the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ; and God also will preserve you steadfast to the end, so that you may be without blame in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.’ ‡

“To the Philippians (i. 6) he expresses his confidence, that ‘he among them who has begun a good work will go on to perfect it till the day of Jesus Christ.’

“We will now take notice of a single passage in the First Epistle of St. John. It has been expected by the later Jews

• 1 Cor. iv. 5.

† Romans xiii. 11, 12.

‡ 1 Cor. i. 4 – 8

that the coming of the Antichrist, or of the Anti-Messiah, would precede that of the Messiah. The same notion seems to have prevailed among the Jews in the time of Christ, and to be referred to by St. John in the following passage:—

“‘Children, it is the last hour; and as you have heard that the Antichrist is coming, so there are now many antichrists, whence we know that it is the last hour.’ *

“There is so little reason to suppose that the Second Epistle ascribed to St. Peter was written by him, that it is not to be quoted as evidence of his opinions. But in his First Epistle (as it is called), that is, probably, in the only writing of his which remains, he says: ‘The end of all things draws near. Be sober, therefore, and watch and pray.’ †

“‘Encourage one another,’ says the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, ‘and so much the more, because you see *the day* is approaching.’ ‡

“I do not refer to the Apocalypse as the work of St. John, for I do not believe it to be so. But as it was written during the latter part of the first, or the early part of the second century, it affords evidence of the opinions of those who were disciples of the Apostles. I regard it as the production of some early Jewish Christian, whose imagination was highly excited by the expected coming of Christ. It does not, I think, appear that he himself intended to assume the character of the Apostle John, or that there is ground for charging him with any fraudulent design. His work, notwithstanding the imperfection of its language, is in a high strain of poetry. The mind of the writer was borne away by his subject. He intended, as I conceive, that his visions should be understood as imaginary only,

* 1 John ii. 18.

† Ch. iv. 7.

‡ Ch. x. 25.

like those of another work of about the same age, the Shepherd of Hermas, or, to take a more familiar example, like those of Bunyan. The conviction was strong upon him, that the second coming of Christ was near at hand; and the object of his work, which in modern times has been so ill understood, was, I believe, to describe the events by which, according to the belief of his age, or his own particular belief, it was to be preceded, accompanied, and followed. In the very commencement of his work, he professes that it relates to events soon to occur; exhorting his readers to attend to what is written, '*because the time is near.*' His words are thus rendered in the Common Version:—

“‘The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants *things which must shortly come to pass*; and he sent and signified it by his angel to his servant John. . . . Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear, the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; *for the time is at hand.*’

“The words, as thus translated, show, I think, that those expositions of the book are erroneous, which suppose it to contain a prophecy of events concerning the Christian Church, extending to our own time and beyond, some of the most important not having yet taken place. Whatever the writer anticipated was, as he believed, shortly to come to pass. But I suppose that the words contain a much clearer indication of his subject, and that the first verse should be thus rendered:—

“‘The Manifestation of Jesus Christ, which God has granted him to show forth to his servants,—what must shortly come to pass which he has signified, sending by his angel to his servant John.

“The near coming of the Lord is several times referred to in the work in express terms. In the seventh verse of the

first chapter, the language which our Saviour used when he figuratively spoke of his coming to the destruction of the Jewish nation, is quoted by the writer: 'Lo! he is coming in clouds, and every eye will see him, and they who pierced him; and all the tribes of the land will lament.'* There are elsewhere similar references to the words of Christ. And the book concludes, as it began, with a declaration, that the events anticipated in it were near at hand; and an explicit indication that the main event expected was the coming of Christ. 'And the angel said to me, Seal not up the words of the prophecy of this book, for the time is near. Lo! I am coming quickly to bring retribution with me, to give to every man according to his works. He who testifies these things says, Surely I am coming quickly. Amen! Come, Lord Jesus!'

"The principal source of illustration for this book is to be found in the language and conceptions of the later Jews, especially their conceptions of events connected with the coming of the Messiah. It is from the neglect of this means of illustration, and from the erroneous notions respecting the character of the work as, properly speaking, prophetic, that the imaginations of most modern expositors have been so bewildered in its study. The coincidence between many of the conceptions of the later Jews, and those expressed by the author of the Apocalypse, leaves little doubt that the former are traditionary, and existed in the time of Christ.

"Though the Second Epistle ascribed to Peter cannot be quoted in evidence of the opinions of that Apostle, it affords proof of a state of opinion and feeling existing among Christians at some period during the first two centuries. The writer

* Compare Matthew xxiv. 30.

says (iii. 3 – 13) : ‘ Be aware of this, that in the last days scoffers will arise, following their own lusts, and saying, Where is his promised coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were since the beginning of the creation. But they wilfully forget, that of old by the word of God there were heavens, and an earth rising out of the water, and surrounded by water, which things being so, the world then existing was destroyed, being inundated by water ; but the present heavens and the present earth are by his word reserved for fire, being kept for a day when the impious will be judged and destroyed. Forget not this one thing, beloved, that a day with the LORD is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as a day. The LORD is not tardy in performing his promise (as some think him tardy), but is patient toward us, not willing that any should perish, but that all should attain reformation. But the day of the LORD will come as a thief, in which the heavens will pass away with a roaring sound, and the elements will melt with fervent heat, and the earth and all its works will be burnt up. Seeing, then, that all present things are to be dissolved, what ought you to be in all holy conduct and pious dispositions, expecting and earnestly desiring the coming of the day of God, in which the heavens will be dissolved by fire, and the elements melt with fervent heat. But we, according to his promise, expect new heavens and a new earth, in which righteousness will dwell.’

“ Though the author does not in this passage explicitly speak of the coming of Christ, — for by the title ‘ LORD ’ God is here intended, — yet I suppose there is no controversy that he connected in his imagination the consummation of all present things, which he describes, with that event. It appears, then, from what he says, that there had been so much expectation

among Christians of the speedy return of Christ, as to afford occasion for the ridicule of scoffers. The writer, it seems, conceived that it would be attended with the renovation of all things by fire; a conception which is not to be confounded with that of the consummation of all things by fire at the termination of the Messiah's reign. The former seems to have been peculiar, and borrowed, not from the notions of the Jews concerning the coming of the Messiah, but from Gentile philosophy, particularly the Stoic. There is nothing answering to it elsewhere in the New Testament, nor, I think, in the Jewish traditions. It is quite different from the notions entertained by the earliest Christian Fathers, which correspond to those held by the Jews, and expressed in the Apocalypse; though they comprised much which had nowhere been taught by any Apostle. The earlier Fathers believed, to quote the description of Justin Martyr, who appeals to the Apocalypse as his authority, that Jerusalem was to be rebuilt, adorned, and enlarged; that there was to be a resurrection, in which the followers of Christ who were dead, together with the patriarchs and prophets and other pious Jews, were to return to life; that these, with the body of Christians, were to inhabit that city with Christ, rejoicing, for a thousand years, at the end of which would follow the general resurrection and judgment of all. This is the doctrine of the Millennium, of the visible reign of Christ in person upon earth; a doctrine which the earlier Christians would be disposed to receive the more eagerly in consequence of the oppression, persecution, and deprivation they were suffering. It was, however, rejected and opposed by Origen. When Christianity became the religion of the state, and worldly prosperity shone on its professors, the doctrine gradually faded out of notice; but it has existed to our own

age, transmitted or revived, being held at different periods by some one or other more enthusiastic sect, in connection with the belief that the expected kingdom of Christ is at hand.

“We will now confine our attention to the opinions of the Apostles, which are to be carefully distinguished from all the additions made to them by others. I have quoted the writings of different Apostles. Probably there were differences of opinion among them concerning the circumstances which would attend the coming of our Lord; but they all appear to have expected his personal and visible return to earth as an event not distant; and to have believed that he would come to exercise judgment, to reward his faithful followers, to punish the disobedient, and to destroy his foes. St. Paul, likewise, expected that ‘the dead who were Christ’s’ would be raised at his coming. He further tells the Thessalonians, that the followers of Christ then living would be borne up in the air to meet the Lord and continue ever with him;—words which imply, that he believed that the end of all present things was to be connected with the coming of Christ. To the Corinthians, after speaking of the resurrection of the followers of Christ at his coming, he says: ‘Then will be the *end*, when he will deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; after destroying all dominion and all authority and power. For he must reign till He has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy, Death, shall be destroyed. . . . And when all things are put under him, then will the Son himself be subject to Him who put all things under him, that God may be all in all.’ * We are likewise led to the conclusion that St. Paul connected the end of the world with the coming of Christ, by the

* 1 Cor. xv. 24 – 28.

strong language that he uses concerning the general judgment of men, which was then to take place. Thus he says to Timothy: ‘I charge thee before God, and before Jesus Christ, who will judge the living and the dead when he shall appear in his kingdom’; * and the conception, that we must ‘all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ to receive according to what we have done in the body, either good or evil,’ is one which he repeatedly expresses. † That he looked for the end of the world as following the coming of Christ, may be inferred also from his describing those who should then rise as passing from mortality to immortality, and as clothed with spiritual bodies. ‘Flesh and blood,’ he says, ‘cannot inherit the kingdom of God.’ ‡ St. Peter and St. John likewise speak of ‘its being the last time’; and of ‘the end of all things being at hand.’ It is to be particularly observed, that there is no intimation given by any Apostle of a millennial reign of Christ; a circumstance which, among many others, serves to show that the Apocalypse, in which this doctrine is clearly taught, was not the work of St. John.

“SUCH, then, appear to have been the opinions of the Apostles respecting the second coming of their Master. I have been led to speak of this subject, so important in many of its relations, from its special bearing upon the explanations which I have given of the language of our Saviour. I have endeavored to show, that his language concerning his future coming, the establishment of his kingdom on earth, and his passing judgment upon all men, presents no difficulty when compared with

* 2 Timothy iv. 1.

† Romans xiv. 10; 2 Corinthians v. 10

‡ 1 Corinthians xv. 50.

subsequent events; that his expressions are figurative, and that their explanation is to be found in analogous metaphors, the meaning of which is obvious; and that, however bold some of them may appear, they do not transcend the genius of the Oriental style. But we find, on the other hand, that his Apostles, through causes which I have endeavored partly to explain, instead of a figurative coming, expected a literal return of their Master to earth, before the generation then living should pass away; that, instead of a figurative judgment, they believed that on his return he would judge all men in person; and that, in connection with these events, they anticipated the end of all things. These expectations were erroneous; and before the explanation which has been given of the words of Christ can be fully admitted, this error must be understood. We must not read over the passages in which it is expressed with a confused misapprehension of their sense, as if they related to events still future, and were at the same time coincident in meaning with the language of Christ.

“NOTHING more need be said to illustrate the difference which I suppose to exist between his meaning and the conceptions of the Apostles respecting his future coming. But there are questions and considerations suggested by the facts brought forward, which, though not *immediately* connected with the subject of this work, are too important to be passed over in silence. Why, it may be asked, did not our Saviour prevent his Apostles from falling into the error we have remarked? The answer to this question will open to us views of much importance to be attended to in the study of the New Testament.

“On many subjects our Saviour refrained from entering into a full explanation, and correcting the errors of his hearers

They were errors not intimately connected with the essential truths of religion. The course of events, the advance of human reason, and the progress of knowledge, would afford sufficient correctives; and he was not sent to deliver men from all false opinions, and to furnish a digest of truth upon every subject. An error not important may be so interwoven with an essential truth, that it can be separated only by the hazardous experiment of unravelling the whole web. A misapprehension of facts may be strongly associated with feelings practically true. Their roots may be so twisted round it, that there is danger of eradicating them in the attempt to remove it. Nor does the communication of truth depend upon the instructor alone. No instructor can give a child the knowledge of a man. He to whom God had opened the treasure-house of wisdom could not make all his most willing hearers as wise as himself. Putting out of view all miraculous influence upon the mind, men can be advanced in intellectual improvement only in proportion to the progress which they have already made. A truth, however clearly presented, must be in some accordance with the previous habits of thinking of him to whom it is addressed, in order to be clearly apprehended; and a truth ill apprehended, detached from the relations in which it ought to be viewed, may be more mischievous than the error which it is intended to supplant. Men must be taught, as our Saviour taught them, as 'they are able to bear it.' To have enabled his hearers fully to comprehend all facts and truths connected with Christianity, and to have freed their minds from all false conceptions concerning the Messiah and his kingdom, and every topic which has, or may be supposed to have, a bearing upon religion, could have been effected only by a miracle which would almost have changed their identity. Supposing that in the particular case

of the Apostles such a miracle had been wrought, still their hearers would have been as dull of apprehension as were those whom Christ taught. Had the Apostles been placed in all respects on an equality with their Master; had they been guided throughout by the same perfect judgment, which implies not merely the highest intellectual, but the highest moral excellence; had they each been qualified to supply his place, and entitled to every name of honor which belongs to him, their disciples would have held the same place which they themselves now do as disciples of Christ. They must have taught their followers as their Master had taught them; and whenever this miraculous regeneration of intellect ceased, and men's minds were left to their natural action, and the current of their opinions was suffered to pursue its ordinary course, — whenever infallibility was no longer secured by the power of God, — errors of some kind would necessarily mingle with men's religious faith. As regards the Apostles, we believe that their minds were enlightened by the Spirit of God, and by direct miraculous communications from him, in regard to the essential truths of Christianity. But we have no warrant to believe, nor is there any probable argument to show, that this divine illumination was further extended.

“Our Saviour came to teach the essential truths of religion. Even these truths were but imperfectly apprehended by most of those who heard him, and, I may add, have been but imperfectly apprehended by most of those who, from his time to our own, have professed themselves to be his disciples. When we find, that, on the last night of his ministry, one of his Apostles said to him, ‘Master, show us the Father, and we shall be satisfied.’ * it may be perceived that there were difficulties enough

* John xiv. 8.

to be overcome in communicating to them a full apprehension of those elementary truths. Their attention was not to be withdrawn from them by discussions, doubts, questions, and explanations respecting subjects of comparatively little importance, concerning which they might have adopted the errors of their age. When, referring to the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls, a doctrine at that time generally connected with the belief of their immortality, they asked, 'Master, who sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?'* our Saviour in his answer did not explain to them the mistake implied in those words. When, under the belief common to their countrymen, that the sufferings of this life were punishments from God, certain individuals came to tell him of the 'Galilæans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices,'† there was nothing in his reply to correct their false conceptions. The relative importance of different doctrines, the wide separation which divides what is essential in true religion from all the accessory notions that men have made a part of their religion, is very little understood at the present day, and was not better understood by the Jews eighteen centuries ago. In most minds, those opinions which they believe or fancy to have anything of a religious character are disposed without regard to perspective. They all stand forward equal in magnitude. It is one of the most striking characteristics of the teaching of Christ, that the distinction between the essential truths of religion and all other doctrines, true or false, was never confounded by him. He fixed the attention of his hearers only upon what it most concerned them to know as religious beings, that is, as creatures of God and heirs of immortality. In order to effect this purpose, it was necessary for him to confine his teaching to the essential

* John ix. 2.

† Luke xiii. 1.

truths of religion. If he had done otherwise, if he had labored to correct the errors of his hearers upon subjects of minor importance, and to place the truth distinctly before them in all those new relations which it might present, his hearers would unavoidably have confounded the doctrines thus taught them upon divine authority with those essential principles which alone it was the purpose of God to announce. Their imaginations and feelings might perhaps have been more occupied about what it was of little consequence for them to know, than about truths which it was of the highest concern that they should understand themselves, and be qualified to teach to others.

“ But there is another aspect under which the subject is to be viewed. We must consider, not merely the disciples, but the enemies of Christ; we must regard the character of the ignorant, prejudiced, unstable multitudes whom he addressed, and whom his Apostles were to address; and we must recollect, that whatever he taught to his Apostles was in effect taught to all; that it was their proper office to publish his whole doctrine. Now in communicating to men the essential truths of religion, and in confining his attention to these alone, he had to encounter prejudices and passions the most obstinate and violent. Superstition, fanaticism, and hypocrisy, all that is in most direct opposition to the love of God and man, constituted the religion of a great part of the Jews. It was vital to the selfish purposes and to the authority of those who were leaders among the people, that the errors which prevailed should retain their power over men’s minds. The bigotry of false religion was at the same time inflamed by national pride. This opposition Christ had to encounter, and hence he was assailed throughout his ministry with continual cavil, reproach, and

persecution ; and he saw from its commencement, that he should soon become their victim. The circumstances in which he was placed required the utmost circumspection, judgment, and self command. No new prejudice was to be needlessly excited. No unnecessary occasion of cavil was to be presented. No opportunity for perverting or contradicting his words was to be given, that could be avoided consistently with the purpose of his mission. It was not for him to waste the numbered days of his ministry, in which so much was to be accomplished, to perplex his hearers, and to exasperate his foes, by entering into controversy or explanations respecting topics of minor concern. The hold which a prejudice has upon the mind is often out of all proportion to any show of proof that may be brought in its support. Questions, the discussion of which we should now regard only as an object of ridicule, have in other ages been the occasion of rancorous contention. In the fourteenth century, a dispute raged in the Greek empire concerning the question, whether the light which shone round Christ at his transfiguration was created or uncreated. Four councils were assembled, and those who affirmed it to be created, and held the consequences which were supposed to be connected with this doctrine, were anathematized as worse than all other heretics.* If a new teacher of TRUE RELIGION had been sent from God to the men of that age, we may easily comprehend, that few mistakes would have tended more to render his mission fruitless, than for him to have entered into any explanation, or to have passed any judgment, upon this controversy. In the defence of what we now consider as gross errors, a blind and deaf

* See Petavii Dogmata Theologica. De Deo Deique Proprietatibus, Lib. I. c. 12.

bigotry has been displayed, the strength of which it is hard to estimate since the delusion has passed away. It is not yet two centuries since the denial of the then common belief of witchcraft was regarded as implying the denial of the agency of any spiritual being, of the existence of the invisible world, and consequently as virtual atheism.* In the time of Christ, and for a long period before, the doctrine of dæmoniacal possession prevailed among the Jews, and many diseases were ascribed to this cause. Our Saviour never taught that this was a false doctrine. He occasionally used language conformed to the conceptions of those who believed it to be true. Why was he silent on this subject? Why did he leave some, if not all, of his Apostles in error concerning it, as appears from the common belief being expressed in the first three Gospels, though not in that of St. John? Let us consider, that, if he had taught the truth, he would immediately have been denounced by his enemies as an unbeliever in the invisible world, as a Sadducee teaching that 'there was neither angel nor spirit'; — that the error in question was intimately connected with many others, concerning the existence of Satan, the origin of evil, the rules of God's govern-

“ * ‘For my part,’ says Sir Thomas Browne, ‘I have ever believed, and do now know, that there are witches. They that doubt of them do not only deny them, but spirits; and are obliquely and of consequence a sort, not of infidels, but atheists.’ (Religio Medici, Part I.) Glanvill’s ‘SADDUCISMUS Triumphatus’ is a work in defence of the common superstition, by one of the able men of his age, in which he represents, as may be supposed from the title, all disbelievers in witchcraft as destitute of religion. A great part of Dr. Henry More’s ‘Antidote to Atheism’ consists of stories of supposed supernatural events, apparitions, witchcraft, and pretended miraculous operations of God’s providence.”

ment of the world, the mental and physical constitution of man, and the power of magic and incantations ; — that it would have been idle to declare himself against one of these errors unless he had opposed them all ; — that he was surrounded by ignorant and prejudiced hearers, wholly unaccustomed to exercise their minds upon any general truth ; — and that, had it been possible to instruct them thoroughly upon any one of the subjects I have mentioned, he must, in order to effect this, have turned aside from the great purpose of his ministry, and have withdrawn their attention from it. It would have been the labor of a long life to enlighten the minds of any considerable number of Jews upon topics such as these.

“ Let us consider another case. The Jews had adopted what is called the *allegorical* mode of interpreting their sacred books ; and had found many supposed predictions and types of their expected Messiah in factitious senses which they ascribed to particular passages. This mode of interpretation was adopted by some of the Apostles. We find examples of it as used by them in the Gospels of both Matthew and John, and in the Acts of the Apostles. One is surprised, perhaps, that this mistake was not corrected by Christ. Nothing may seem more simple, than that he should have indicated that this whole system of interpretation, and this method of proof, so far as the supposed prophecies were applied to himself, were erroneous. But would you have had him at the same time teach the whole art of interpretation ? If he had not done so, errors as great might have been committed from some other cause. If he had corrected some wrong conceptions only, and left others, the latter from that very circumstance would have acquired new authority. But to have taught the art of interpretation **only** would not have been sufficient to enable his hearers to

become skilful expositors of the Old Testament; he must have settled the yet disputed questions concerning the age, the authorship, the authority, and what has been called the inspiration, of the different writings that compose it; and whoever has studied these subjects with an unbiased and inquiring mind may, I think, be satisfied that the truth concerning them is such as no Jew was prepared to listen to, and few indeed would have listened to without astonishment and wrath.

“ But let us suppose that he had attempted only to correct the single error which consisted in the false application of many passages to the Messiah; what would have been the consequence? His enemies would undoubtedly have contended, that it was idle to suppose *him* to be the Messiah. He does not even pretend, they would have triumphantly said, to be the object of the prophecies by which, according to all those learned in the Law and in our traditions, the Messiah is foretold. Perhaps he would have us believe, that no Messiah has been promised; but that he has as good a claim as any other to that title. Has he not come from Beelzebub, to teach that the prophecies are false and our hopes vain, that God has ceased to care for his people, and thus to seduce us from our faith and allegiance?

“ BUT in connection with this subject there is another fact to be attended to. In teaching or enforcing truth, the language of error may be used in order powerfully to affect the feelings; because it has associations with it which no other language will suggest. Such use of it implies no assent to the error on which it is founded. He who employs the epithets ‘diabolical,’ or ‘fiendish,’ affords from that circumstance alone no reason to suppose that he believes in the existence of devils or fiends.

There is much language of the same character. We still borrow many expressions from imaginary beings of ideal beauty and grace, from fairies and sylphs, beings whose real existence was once believed. We have no reluctance to use words derived from the false opinions concerning witchcraft, possession, and magic. We use those which have been mentioned, and many terms of a similar kind, because they furnish, or seem to furnish, expressions more forcible than we could otherwise command. But this fact has been disregarded in reasoning from the language of Christ. Expressions founded upon the conceptions of the Jews, and used by him because no other modes of speech would have so powerfully affected their minds, have been misunderstood as intended to convey a doctrine taught by himself. This remark is applicable to those few passages in his discourses in which he speaks, according to the belief of the Jews, of Satan as if he were a real being, such as the following: ‘I saw Satan falling from heaven like lightning’; — ‘Your father is the Devil, and you are ready to execute his evil purposes’; — ‘The enemy who sowed the tares is the Devil’; — and particularly to the figurative and parabolic narrative in which he represented himself as having been tempted by Satan. I say in which he represented himself, for it is evident that the narrative of the Evangelists could have been derived from Christ alone. Satan was regarded by the Jews as the great adversary of God and man, the Tempter, the Accuser, the source of moral and physical evil. No words could so forcibly impress them with a conception of the odiousness and depravity of any act or character, as by resembling it to him, or referring it to him as its suggester or author. They were familiar with the imagination of such a being, and through **this** imagination their minds were most powerfully to be affected.

The abstract idea of moral evil, if, indeed, they could have apprehended it, would have been to them a shadowy phantom, compared with it as hypostatized and vivified in its supposed malignant author. Under circumstances in which it is impossible to explain the whole truth, or in which it is certain that the whole truth cannot be understood and felt, in addressing men who are unaccustomed to exercise their understandings, and who from childhood have incorporated false conceptions with right principles of action, we may use their errors for their reformation; we may appeal to their feelings or their fears through their mistaken imaginations; we may employ one wrong opinion to counteract others more pernicious; and in reasoning, exhortation, or reproof, we may thus avail ourselves of their more innocent prejudices in opposition to their passions and vices. But in doing this, we are precluded from directly assailing those prejudices; though we may at the same time be establishing truths which will effect their gradual abolition. Such was, I believe, in some particulars, the mode of teaching adopted by Christ.

“IN regard to some of the errors of his disciples, it may be a question whether the plainest language would in itself alone have been sufficient to remove them. I may rather say, it evidently would not have been sufficient. The very subject of this volume shows, if the opinions maintained in it be true, that the plainest language has not been sufficient to preserve men from the grossest errors. Yet the words of Christ have not less authority as recorded in the Gospels, than when uttered by his own lips. But we are not obliged to reason thus indirectly. We may see in the accounts of his ministry, how often our Saviour was *not* understood by his disciples. As he was ap-

proaching Jerusalem for the last time, he called the Twelve together and said: 'Lo! we are going up to Jerusalem,' and the Son of Man 'will be delivered into the hands of the Gentiles, and mocked, and insulted, and spit upon; and having scourged him, they will put him to death; and on the third day he will return to life.' No language can be more simple and explicit than this. But the Evangelist goes on to relate, that the Apostles 'understood this not at all; the meaning of his words was hidden from them, and they did not comprehend what he said.'* How little they understood this and other declarations of Christ may appear from the fact, that the next event recorded by the Evangelists is the application on the part of James and John for the highest places, under Christ, in that temporal kingdom on which their hopes were still fixed. The prediction of his resurrection, though repeatedly made by him, was, we know, so little comprehended by them, that no hope, and apparently no thought, of that event was entertained by them after his death. It is not strange, therefore, that they expected a visible return of our Saviour from heaven, to establish his kingdom, though he himself had declared, 'The kingdom of God is not coming with any show that may be watched for; nor will men say, Lo! it is here; or, Lo! it is there; for lo! the kingdom of God is within you'; and though in the clearest manner, and under circumstances the most solemn, he had affirmed, 'My kingdom is not of this world.'

"WE are apt to fall into a great mistake, from not distinguishing between the feelings and conceptions, the whole state of character, of an enlightened Christian at the present day, and

* Luke xviii. 31 - 34.

those of the Jews to whom Christ preached. It may seem to us as if a few words of his would have been sufficient to do away any error, however inveterate, because we think their effect would be such upon our own minds. We may wonder that those words were not uttered. We may almost be tempted to ask, Why was a teacher from God so sparing of his knowledge, so limited in his instructions? Why did he not deliver his Apostles at least from all their mistaken apprehensions having any connection with the facts or truths of religion? How could he leave the world with so many false and pernicious opinions existing around him in full vigor, against which he had not declared himself? And why, with the same feelings we might go on to ask, do the great truths of religion appear, as disclosed by him, in such naked, monumental, severe grandeur? Why do they stand alone, separated from all truths not essential to our faith? Why were not the many questions answered, the many doubts solved, which we might be disposed to lay before Christ, or which his disciples, if we imagine them as inquiring and as teachable as ourselves, might have proposed?

“To inquiries such as these it has been my purpose to afford some answer in what has been suggested. As a teacher from God, it was the proper and sole office of Christ to make known to men, on the authority of God, the fundamental truths of religion. To inculcate these alone was a task which demanded all his efforts, his own undivided attention, and that of his most willing hearers. They were to be kept distinct from all other truths. The minds of men were not to be withdrawn from them by bringing any other subject into discussion. When we ask why Christ did not proceed further to enlighten his hearers, we forget how unprepared they were for such instruction, what prejudices must have been overcome, what wrong

associations broken, how much of inquiry on their part, and of explanation on his, would have been necessary, how liable his language was to be misunderstood, and how fatal it would have been to the purpose of his mission thus to occupy their thoughts upon topics unconnected with it. We forget what opposition he had to encounter, how all his words and actions were watched with malignant eyes, how often his enemies came proposing questions to try what he would say, that they might find opportunity to injure him.* We do not remember, that no error could be touched without affording some new occasion or pretence of hatred; and that whatever he spoke would be misunderstood, perverted, misrepresented, and made a ground for false inferences. We do not keep in mind the imperfect apprehensions of his disciples, of which we find continual notices in the Gospels, and the utter indocility of the great body of the Jews, which is equally apparent. We forget, that, after a ministry of unintermitted effort, he fell a sacrifice to the truths which he did teach. In asking why his instructions did not extend to other truths, and to the correction of errors not essential, we forget how difficult was his proper office, we forget by whom he was surrounded, we forget the reproach that was forced from his lips: ‘O unbelieving and perverse race! how long shall I be with you? How long must I bear with you?’ It was not to men so little ready to receive his essential doctrines that any unnecessary instruction was to be addressed. We mistake altogether the state of the case, when, in reading the Gospels, we conceive of Christ as teaching with the same freedom of explanation, and with the same use of language, with which we may perhaps reasonably suppose that he would have taught

* The Common Version says, ‘to tempt him.’ ”

a body of enlightened men, receiving his words with the entire deference with which we now regard them.

“The wisdom and the self-restraint, for so it is to be considered, of our Saviour, in confining his teaching to the essential truths of religion, and the broad distinction which he thus made between these and all other doctrines, appear to me among the most striking proofs of the divinity of his mission. I cannot believe, that a merely human teacher would have conducted himself with such perfect wisdom; that he would never have attempted to use his authority, or have displayed his superior knowledge, in maintaining other truths than those which essentially concern the virtue and happiness of mankind; that he would have refrained from exposing or contradicting the errors of his opponents on any other subjects; that he would have succeeded in communicating to his disciples those principles which are the foundation of all religion and morality, without perplexing their minds by the discussion of any topics less important; and, at last, have left his doctrine a monument for all future time,—not like the works of some enlightened men, which perish with the errors they destroy, but remaining a universal code of instruction for mankind.

“BUT there is another very different point of view, under which the subject we have been examining affords, I think, proof of the divine origin of Christianity. If the Gospels are an authentic account of what was done and said by Christ, no question can remain whether Christ were a teacher from God. But that they are so, we have evidence in the facts which have been brought to view.

“When we compare the language of Christ respecting his future coming with the expectations expressed by his Apostles,

we perceive that his language was misunderstood by them. He did not predict his visible return to earth to be the judge of men. There is nothing in his words which requires or justifies such an interpretation of them. It has appeared, I trust, that the figurative language which he used is to be understood in a very different sense.

“ But the Apostles, from various causes, were expecting such a return of their Master. Their words admit of no probable explanation except as referring to this anticipated event. What, then, follows as a correct inference from this comparison?

“ It follows, that the words relating to this subject, which are ascribed to Christ in the Gospels, were truly his words. They were not falsely ascribed to him. They were not imagined for him. They were not conformed to the apprehensions of his followers. Had his followers fabricated or intentionally modified the words, they would have made their Master say what they themselves have said, in language as explicit as their own.

“ Here, then, we have evidence of the most unsuspicious kind, for it is clearly evidence which it was the purpose of no individual to furnish, that certain words recorded in the Gospels were uttered by Christ. The writers of these books did not in this case fabricate language expressive of their own opinions, and ascribe it to him. And if they did not in this case, concerning a subject on which they taught what he did not teach, we have no reason to suspect them of having, in any other case, intentionally ascribed to him words which he did not utter.

“ The words, then, ascribed to Christ in the Gospels are words of Christ. They have been reported by well-informed individuals, who had no intention of deceiving, and who did not even conform them to their own apprehension of their

meaning. I will not pursue the inferences from these truths. I will only observe, that the proof of them, as we have seen, is, through the providence of God, bound up in the New Testament itself. An error of the Apostles proves the reality of their faith. In seeking to solve a difficulty, we discover unexpected evidence of the truth of Christianity. And I am persuaded, that, as the New Testament is better understood, as the false notions that have prevailed concerning it pass away, and it is made a subject of enlightened investigation and philosophical study, new and irresistible proofs will appear of that fact, of which we can hardly estimate the full magnitude and interest, that Christ was a teacher from God.

“IN reference, indeed, to the very subject we have been examining, there is another consideration well deserving attention. We have seen what were the anticipations of the Apostles concerning the personal return of their Master to earth, and the approaching termination of the world. But in connection with these expectations, a remarkable phenomenon presents itself. We might have supposed, that the imaginations and feelings of the Apostles would have been seized upon and inflamed by the prospect of such events; that they would have continually placed them before the eyes of those whom they addressed, and have urged them upon the thoughts of men; that their exhortations and warnings would always have borne the impress of anticipations so extraordinary and so exciting. But this is not the case. We may read far the greater part of what they have left us in writing, without discovering an intimation that they held such opinions. It is clear, that they did not insist upon the facts in question as of any considerable moment. They introduce the mention of them as

accessory ideas in connection with the doctrine of immortality and retribution. Imagine any other body of individuals laboring with like earnestness and devotion for the reformation of their fellow-men, under a similar belief of the approaching end of the world;—imagine what would be the feelings and language of such individuals, and contrast them with those of the Apostles, and you may perceive what a singular phenomenon is presented in the New Testament.

“In what manner is this phenomenon to be explained? How is the problem to be solved, that men, anticipating the end of the world and the final judgment of mankind as at hand, should have insisted so little upon these events for the purpose of exciting the terrors or the hopes of those whom they addressed? It can be explained, I think, but in one way. The feelings which those expected events would naturally have produced were absorbed in the deeper, the intenser feeling, produced by a thorough conviction of the essential truths of religion. To them, who knew themselves the creatures, the care, the special ministers, of the God of Love; to them, the disciples of his Son, the witnesses, nay, themselves the very agents, of that divine power by which the laws of nature were suspended; to them, before whose view the clouds resting upon eternity had been rolled away,—the consummation of this world was of little more concern than the revolution of an empire. Assured of immortality, and with everything to give strength to the feeling which this assurance is adapted to produce, it was of small moment to them or to their disciples whether with the dead they should be raised incorruptible, or whether with the living they should be changed. One all-penetrating sentiment of the truth of their religion annihilated the power of smaller excitements. Their feelings were calmed by the con-

templation of one absorbing interest, which no changes could affect.

“How, then, was this conviction of the truth of their religion produced, — this conviction which so wrought upon their minds that the anticipated consummation and judgment of the world had no power strongly to move them? There is one answer to this question which a Christian will give. I know of no other.”

THE END.